

1912

Handwritten note

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XXXI

1912

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

v. 31-32

(1912-13)

PART I

PROCEEDINGS	i	<i>B</i>
<hr/>		
THE PASSOVER PAPYRUS FROM ELEPHANTINE	1	
	WILLIAM E. ARNOLD	
BEELEZEBUL	34	
	W. E. M. ALLEN	
THE J. P. MORGAN COLLECTION OF COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS	54	
	HENRI HYVERNAT	

BOSTON

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
AND EXEGESIS

14 BRACON STREET, ROOM 207

AGENTS: G. E. STECHERT & CO., NEW YORK

PARKER & SONS, OXFORD

\$3.00 A YEAR

SINGLE NUMBERS, 90.75

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE FOR 1912

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, University of Pennsylvania

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, Yale University

WILLIAM H. COBB, Congregational Library, Boston

Communications for the Editors should be addressed to the Rev. WILLIAM H. COBB, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Massachusetts.

In ENGLAND copies of the Journal may be had of JAMES PARKER & Co., 27 Broad Street, Oxford, and 51 Bedford Street, Strand, London.

The next meeting of the Society will be held in Washington, D.C., in conjunction with the Archaeological Institute of America, within the week following Christmas.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1912

President	LEWIS B. PATON, Hartford Seminary
Vice-President	GEORGE A. BARTON, Bryn Mawr College
Recording Secretary	WILLIAM H. COBB, Congregational Library, Boston
Corresponding Secretary	JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, University of Penn- sylvania
Treasurer	J. DYNELEY PRINCE, Columbia University HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, Meadville Theo- logical School
Associates in Council	ERNEST D. BURTON, University of Chicago WILLIAM R. ARNOLD, Andover Seminary WALTER R. BETTERIDGE, Rochester Theo- logical Seminary LORING W. BATTER, General Theological Seminary

The Passover Papyrus from Elephantine¹

WILLIAM R. ARNOLD

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

AMONG the papyri discovered at Elephantine in the years 1907 and 1908, and recently published by Professor Sachau of Berlin, is one which relates to the feast of the Passover. It is Papyrus 6 of the Sachau publication.² This brief and fragmentary document is second in interest and importance only to the two papyri which preserve the text of the petition from the Jewish community at Elephantine to the Persian governor of Judea, invoking his aid toward restoring the Yahwè temple of Elephantine, destroyed in 410 B.C.

Papyrus 6 is the original of a letter addressed to this Jewish community at Elephantine in the year 419 B.C., nine years before the destruction of their temple, by a certain Hananyah, a Jew residing at some other locality in Egypt. The papyrus is, and was originally, about four and a half inches long. The fragment of it which remains is about eight and a quarter inches wide. What the original width was, we cannot say, as the left end has been torn off clean at a fold in the papyrus; probably, however, not more than an inch or two is lacking all the way down that end. Unfortunately that is not the extent of the damage. An entire section in addition is missing from the lower right-hand corner, so that in all not more than two-thirds of the original text remains. What remains is perfectly legible, however, and there can be almost no question as to its correct interpretation.

¹ The substance of this article was read at the meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* in New York, December 28, 1911.

² *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-kolonie zu Elephantine*, Leipsic, 1911.

The letter consisted of six complete lines on the obverse side of the papyrus, after two initial words in a separate line at the top, and two and a half lines on the reverse side, besides a docket or address in one line at the lower edge, which appeared on the outside of the document when the latter was folded and sealed. The docket reads :

אחי ידניה וכנותה חילא יהודיא אחוכם חנניה

A portion of the papyrus has been torn away before the word אחי, which probably contained the word אל. So that the address ran as follows: *To my brethren, Yedonyah and his associates the Judean garrison, your brother Hananyah.*

The docket enables us to piece out with assurance the gaps which worms have left in the superscription of the letter. Doing which, we secure the following text (supplementary letters bracketed; seriously mutilated ones overlined):

OBVERSE

1	[אל אחי]
2	יְהוָה וּבְנוֹתָהּ הַיְלֵא [יהויה] אחוכם הַנְּנִיחַ שלם אחי אלהי . . .
3	וּבְעַת שְׁנָתָא זֹאת שְׁנַת וַוּוּ ׀ דִּי־יְהוֹשׁ מַלְכָּא מִן מַלְכָּא שְׁלִיחַ עַל אַרְשׁוֹ . . .
4	כַּעַת אַנְתֶּם בְּן מַנּוּ אַרְבַּעַת עֶשֶׂר . . .
5	הָ וּמִן יוֹם ׀ ׀ ׀ עַד יוֹם בִּי ל . . .
6	דְּכִין חַוִּי וְאֻדְחִי עֲבִידָא אֲלֵי . . .
7	אֵל תַּשְׁתּוּ וְכָל מַנְדַּעַם זִי חַמִּיר א . . .

REVERSE

8	מַעֲרַב שְׁמַשׁ עַד יוֹם בִּי לַנֶּסֶךְ . . .
9	הַנְּעַלּוּ בְּחַתּוּבֵיכֶם חַתּוּמֵי בֵּין יוֹמֵי . . .
10	א . . .

TRANSLATION

- 1 To my brethren,
- 2 Yedonyah and his associates the Judean garrison, your brother Hananyah: The welfare of my brethren may
the Gods
- 3 For the rest: This year, the year 5 of Darius the King, being sent from the King to Arsamnes
Now, do ye count thus fou(teen)
- 4 and from the 15th day to the 21st day of
- 5 Be ye clean and make yourselves ready. No work
- 6 ye shall not drink. And everything that leaven
- 7 the setting of the sun to the 21st day of Nisan
- 8 take into your rooms and lock up between the days of
- 9
- 10

Line 2. The full name of Yedonyah, the leader of the Jewish community at Elephantine at this date, as well as later when the temple was destroyed and for some time thereafter, was *Yedonyah bar Gemaryah*; compare Sachau Papyrus 5 (quoted below); Papyrus 15, where the first name was carelessly spelled ידניא (Sachau transcribes wrongly ידנייה); and Papyrus 18, col. 7, where Yedonyah appears as the custodian of the great collection of money for the temple of Yahwè. Papyrus 15 is not improbably an account of the attack on the temple, when Yedonyah and his companions, the writer among them (read in line 4 כבכא כנא, כבכא כבא, as Sachau), were assaulted (or insulted, אתחרפו, not אתחרבו 'killed,' as suggested by Sachau) while guarding the entrance to the temple. On the etymology of the name Yedonyah, see Sachau, *l.c.*, p. 8, and Lidzbarski, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1911, col. 2980.

After אלהיא we must supply ישאלו, literally, *The welfare of my brethren may the Gods ask after*, idiomatic for *God greet you!* The sentence is a stereotyped Aramaic formula. It does not follow from the use of such an expression that "mehrere Götter unter den jüdischen Kolonen verehrt wurden" (Sachau, *l.c.*, p. 38). On the other hand, although אלהיא is the lexical equivalent of Hebrew האלהים, it is not, in this context, synonymous with Yahwè, as maintained by Eduard Meyer.³ Whether or not the Hebrew האלהים, in the mouth of a Jew of this period, meant Yahwè, would very much depend upon the matter in hand. (Commonly, the surrogate of Yahwè would be אלהים *Deity*, not האלהים *the gods*.) Hananyah certainly did not use a singular verb with the determinate plural noun, or read a meaning of his own into the accepted Aramaic rubric.⁴ Without "worshiping" other gods or conceding their equality with the God of Heaven, even the "orthodox" Jew of this period might in his ordinary mood—the nascent Old Testament literature notwithstanding.—accept both their existence and

³ "Zu den aramäischen Papyri von Elephantine," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1911, p. 1051.

⁴ Compare Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2971.

the fact of their power for good or ill. The long-exiled Judeans of Elephantine might even contribute something to the cultus of the gods of their non-Israelitish Aramean countrymen in Egypt,⁵ without impairing their loyalty to the ancestral god.

Line 3. וּבְקֵצַת, which I render *For the rest*, literally *And now*, introduces the substance of the communication, as in Ezra 4 17 and, in the uncontracted form וּבְקֵצַתָּ, Ezra 4 11, 7 12.

שְׁלִיחַ, passive participle, is not impersonal, as is assumed by Sachau and Ed. Meyer. The subject was indicated in the lost finite verb which followed the word אֲרִשָּׁם, and to which this participle is circumstantial; compare Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, §§ 275, 277. See further below.

Line 4. The detached letters אֵי are apparently preceded by a יוֹדֵיִּא דַּ?

At the end of the line I supplete, with Sachau, Ed. Meyer, and Lidzbarski, [אַרְבָּעַת עָשָׂר], *fourteen*.

Line 5, end. Supply גִּיטָן, after the parallel in line 8.

Line 6. אֲוִדְהֵרֵי, *take warning, prepare yourselves*. עֲבִידָה begins a new sentence.

Line 7. The ך of ךִּי and the ם of חֲמִיר are by no means plain. If one may judge from the photographic reproduction, the ink seems to have run in the fibers of the papyrus. Or perhaps the papyrus is a palimpsest, with the earlier writing not completely removed. In any case, the two characters cannot be read otherwise.

מְנַדְעִים, *thing*, cf. Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 312; occurs a number of times in the papyri.

The א at the end of the line is certain. Doubtless we should supplete, with Sachau, אֵתֵי כֹה, *and everything that has leaven in it*.

Line 9. The first word preserved is not וְעֵלֵי, as Sachau, followed by Ed. Meyer. The mutilated first letter cannot be a ו, but may very well be ג. Read וְנַעֲלֵי (Hanphel of עלל); cf. Sayce-Cowley Papyrus G 6. 7. 24. 27. Only so, moreover, can we construe חַתְמוֹ, which otherwise remains

⁵ Sachau Papyrus 18, col. 7.

without an object. Sachau renders, *tretet in euere Gemächer und versiegelt (macht Schluss?) zwischen den Tagen*. Meyer: *Geht in euere Kammern und siegelt (?) zwischen den Tagen*, adding what he would doubtless admit to be a rather far-fetched interpretation, "Setzt ein Siegel, macht eine Scheidewand zwischen diesen Festtagen und den Werktagen." The single object of הנעלו and חתמו preceded both verbs. We must read חתמו (Pa'il), which does not mean to *seal*, but to *lock up*. The reference is perhaps to merchandise, ordinarily displayed in open booths or upon the street, which they are directed to stow away during the first and seventh days of the feast (see below). If this interpretation is correct, Lidzbarski's suggested reading for the remainder of the line, " בין ימיא *zwischen Tag und Nacht*, entsprechend בין שמשא " (*l.c.*, col. 2970), must be rejected, and we must abide by בין ימי . Is בין *during*?

The original letter contained six or seven more words, beyond the point where the above translation finally breaks off; but (and this is important) it contained no more, for the next line stopped half-way across the papyrus.

It is perfectly clear that we have here a letter of instruction to the Jewish community at Elephantine, with directions for the punctilious observance of a feast to which the seven days extending from the fifteenth to the twenty-first day of the month Nisan sustain some essential relation; a feast which, moreover, requires abstinence from labor during at least a part of its continuance. This can be none other than the Passover — employing the term in the looser sense, of the Passover and feast of Unleavened Bread combined. And with this much assured, we need not hesitate to find in the suspended words of line 7 a reference to the banishing of leaven from every nook and corner of the houses of the faithful.

One point only occasions remark: the prohibition of some sort of beverage. No such prohibition is found in any of the Old Testament laws concerning the Passover. And the beverage in question can hardly have been wine. The later

Rabbinical usage prescribed such repeated potations of wine during the Passover ritual⁶ that drunkenness not infrequently resulted. The New Testament evidence is familiar. It is true that we have no positive testimony to the use of wine during the Passover festivities until late in the second century B.C.⁷ Our earliest witness is the Book of Jubilees, which in 49 6 represents the Israelites as drinking wine at the first Passover in Egypt; this implies that the drinking of wine at the Passover was not merely allowed, but actually customary and regular in the writer's day. However, the suggestion recently made by Beer that wine came into use in connection with the Passover only after 350 B.C. and under Greek influence, is lacking in plausibility. Hannah needed no Greek influence, in the opinion credited to the experienced Eli, on the occasion of another great festival at Shiloh. And while it is not probable that wine-drinking accompanied the celebration of the old nomad Passover, so long as this remained distinct from the Canaanitish feast of Unleavened Bread, it is hard to believe that the latter feast was ever observed without the use of wine, if there was any to be had. The fact will be that wine came into use in connection with the Passover ritual when, and in proportion as, it was combined and identified, in post-exilic Judaism, with the feast of Unleavened Bread. In any case, we have no reason to believe that there ever was a time when the use of wine at the Passover or at the feast of Unleavened Bread was actually prohibited. For the rest, the fact that the Old Testament laws contain no prohibition of any particular beverage, and that this brief letter of instruction to the Jews of Elephantine specifically prohibits one, leaves no doubt that the reference in the latter is to some beverage very common in Egypt and almost if not quite unknown in Palestine. This must be beer.⁸ Egyptian beer, produced from barley with the addition of certain vegetable ingredients,⁹

⁶ Mishna, Pesahim 10 1.

⁷ See Beer, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1911, p. 163.

⁸ So also Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2970. I owe the suggestion, together with the reference to the Mishnic law, to Professor George F. Moore.

⁹ See Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, I, pp. 53 f.

was held to fall clearly under the law of forbidden leaven: a passage in the Mishna¹⁰ prohibits explicitly, during the Feast of Passover, the use of "Egyptian beer," together with other fermented liquids into which cereals have entered.

From the limited dimensions of our papyrus, and especially from the distribution of the surviving material, it is quite certain that the papyrus made no reference whatever to the slaying of the Passover lamb. The only available space for the mention of the Passover lamb is in the first half of line 5, and not even all of that half-line is available, for at least the word לֶחֶם must have stood there to complete the sentence at the end of line 4. There is room for only three or four words, not enough for the barest reference to the rite, to say nothing of any instructions in connection with it. In other words, *our papyrus related solely to the feast of Unleavened Bread.*

Nor may we suppose that the Passover lamb is to be omitted from the observance out of regard for the susceptibilities of the native Egyptians and their aversion to the slaughter of rams and he-goats, as was done later with all animal sacrifices at the restoration of the temple of Elephantine.¹¹ For it must be remembered that for nine years after the date of this papyrus, animal sacrifices continued to be offered uninterruptedly in the Yahwè temple at Elephantine. Up to this point there had been no trouble with the Egyptians. In fact, as we shall see, it is with this very communication of Hananyah's that the era of "trouble" begins.

Now a national Israelitish feast of Passover, as distinguished from the feast of Unleavened Bread, is unknown to both J and E. The word הַפֶּסַח in the so-called J Decalogue (Ex. 34 25) is a gloss: הַן הַפֶּסַח is impossible Hebrew, and the parallel passage in Ex. 23 18 shows that it is הַפֶּסַח which is interpolated, and not הַן , as maintained by Stade.¹² The injunction of Ex. 34 25 = 23 18 related to (the fat of) the sacrifice at any feast of Yahwè. The Passover is unknown

¹⁰ Pesahim, 31.

¹¹ See Sachau Papyri 5 and 3; and compare Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2968.

¹² *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 197.

also to E. Both these documents know only the feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 34 18, 23 15). I am not affirming that both or either of these authors had never heard of the Passover sacrifice, and that one or other of them may not have had it in mind in the story of the pretended "Feast of Yahwè" which the Children of Israel were to celebrate on coming out of Egypt, although there is less to support this view than is generally assumed. I am maintaining that neither of them incorporates it in his summary of the obligatory institutions common to all Israel in his own day. It need not have been such, any more than the vastly more important, and certainly annual, feast of Sheep-Shearing.

The earliest mention of the Passover in the Torah of Israel, and the earliest authentic occurrence of the word פסח in the literature of the Old Testament, is in the Deuteronomic law (Dt. 16).¹³ Even thereafter, Ezekiel still makes no mention of it. For in Ez. 45 21 again, the word הפסח is a gloss, this time inserted against the grain, before the word ית, by some reader who thought the feast beginning on the fourteenth day of the first month must be פסח, though the writer himself had called it the Seven-Day Feast of מצות. In Ex. 12 18 the Priest Code makes Mazzoth begin on the evening of the fourteenth day.

The section on the Passover and Unleavened Bread in Dt. 16, where the two feasts are interwoven, is unquestionably conflated. It has been plausibly supposed (Steuernagel) that D had originally no feast of Unleavened Bread, but only Passover, besides the other two great feasts, and that the verses 3, 4, 8, which introduce the unleavened bread, are later expansions. However that may be, the narrative of Josiah's celebration in 2 Ki. 23 21-23 leaves no room for question (1) that D had the Passover as one of the three great annual feasts, whether or not combined with the eating of unleavened bread for seven days, and (2) that until the publication of the Deuteronomic law the Passover had not been recog-

¹³ Cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* 6, p. 82.

nized as a great sanctuary festival in Israel, at any rate not since the occupation of Canaan.¹⁴

In spite of all this, however, we must not hasten to assign our papyrus to pre-Deuteronomic influences. For though D introduced the Passover sacrifice, which is absent from the papyrus, into the national law, it explicitly limited that sacrifice, as well as all others, to the one single sanctuary of Jerusalem (Dt. 16 5-6). And the priestly legislation and narrative take this limitation for granted. They certainly do not repudiate it.¹⁵ So that there are other and sufficient reasons for omitting the Passover sacrifice from the celebration at Elephantine. To be sure, the Jews at Elephantine had a sanctuary of their own, at which they would have felt as free to sacrifice the Passover as any other animal offering. But our papyrus relates to a ritual which is being delivered to them, as we shall see, directly from abroad, and presumably from Palestine. It is not likely that the authorities at Jerusalem would be deliberately counseling the Jews of Elephantine to violate the law *by innovation*, although they might perhaps hesitate to interfere with a sacrificial cultus which had existed continuously for a hundred and seventy years.

On the other hand, that our papyrus comes from a source

¹⁴ Such is the meaning of the Hebrew of verse 22: *For no such Pesah had been made during (not from) the days of the judges who judged Israel and during all the days of the kings of Israel and the kings of Judah.*

¹⁵ On this point more or less confusion prevails. We are told that the priestly legislation (Ex. 12) restored the Passover sacrifice from the sanctuary, to which it had been limited by D, to the homes of the people. But the fact is, that though P relegated the institution of it to the pre-Sinaitic days when there was no sanctuary, he took especial pains to assert that for all time thereafter it was to be a sanctuary festival: *והזבח אשרו תזבחו ליהוה לדרתיכם הקח שלם תמננו* (Ex. 12 14). Contrast with this language the expression employed in connection with the observance of the law regarding Unleavened Bread (verse 17). Had P actually made of the Passover lamb a home-institution, it would to-day be sacrificed in every quarter of the globe. The Passover of later Judaism was a home-festival only in the sense that after the lamb had been offered in the temple, it was eaten in the dwellings of the people *in attendance at the feast in Jerusalem*, not in the sense that it could be slain wherever one happened to reside. And we have no reason to believe that P intended any more latitude than this.

familiar with the priestly legislation, is indisputable.¹⁶ It prescribes only the feast of Unleavened Bread, but it is the feast of the priestly law, not that of J or of E, nor yet that of Deuteronomy in its present form. For, the determination of the precise days of the month, during which the seven days' feast shall be observed, appears only in H and P. J designates no more than "seven days in the month Abib." The same is true of E.¹⁷ D, in its expanded form, likewise requires merely seven days in the month Abib. All these, of course, represent the earlier and freer practice, the precise time depending upon the forwardness of the crops, which would vary from year to year and in different localities in the same year. A new element, however, in the (expanded) Deuteronomic law, unknown to J and E, is the injunction to observe the last of the seven days as a holiday, during which no work may be performed. But even this is behind the requirements of the priestly law.

It is only with the Holiness Code (Lev. 23 5-8) that we come upon the fixed determination of the days of the month for the observance of the feast of Unleavened Bread. H appoints the Passover proper (פסח לילה) for the fourteenth day of the first month; it is, indeed, probable that the Passover had always been a full-moon ceremony. Thereafter, the feast of Unleavened Bread (חג המצות) is to begin on the fifteenth day and last seven days. Both the first and the seventh days are מקרא קדש, solemn assemblies, and on those days בל מלאכת עבודה לא תעשו, *ye shall do nothing involving labor*. H does not actually connect the observances of Pesah and Mazzoth — any more than do the modern Samaritans. A person who had only the Holiness Code before him (with, perhaps, D in its original form) could easily concern himself with the observance of the one, while avoiding any mention of the other.

P's law of the Passover is contained in Ex. 12 3-14, and that of Mazzoth in Ex. 12 15-20, the section immediately fol-

¹⁶ Cf. Ed. Meyer, *l.c.*, p. 1052.

¹⁷ The authenticity of even this indefinite seven-day requirement in the oldest codes has been questioned, but, I think, without reason.

lowing. But here the two are actually combined. Not only are מצות mentioned in verse 8, but verse 15, which begins the law of Mazzoth, contains no date. The date follows later incidentally, in verse 18: *from the fourteenth day of the month at sunset, to the twenty-first day of the month at sunset.*¹⁸ In P, as in H, the first and seventh days of the feast are "solemn assemblies," on which no labor may be performed.

On the whole, it is seen, our papyrus has closer affinities with H than with any other of the codes of the Pentateuch. The actual mention of the fifteenth day is found only in H, although the law of P does not materially differ from it. Also, in H the feast of Mazzoth is still distinct from the rite of Passover; which would make it easy to avoid even the name of Pesah.¹⁹ Perhaps, too, the language in which the papyrus prohibits labor is reminiscent of H: עבדה לא in the papyrus; כל מלאכת עבדה לא תעשו in H; כל מלאכה לא

¹⁸ There is, by the way, no warrant for the statement sometimes made, and repeated by Eduard Meyer (*l.c.*, p. 1052, note 1), that Ex. 12 stretches the feast from seven days to eight. The "evening of the fourteenth day" is exactly when the fifteenth day begins, and the "evening of the twenty-first day" is in any case exactly seven whole days thereafter. There is, therefore, no reason for denying this verse to P, but quite the contrary.

¹⁹ The occurrence of מצות on an ostrakon (Sachau, Plate 64, 2; previously published by Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, II, pp. 229 ff.), to which Ed. Meyer refers (*l.c.*, p. 1051, note 3), would prove nothing as regards our papyrus, even if the context were perfectly clear; for the ostrakon is of unknown date and uncertain provenance.

On the other hand, the "Aramean Ostrakon from Elephantine," published by Sayce, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1911, pp. 183 f., which he finds "especially interesting on account of its reference to the Passover," has been wrongly deciphered and entirely misinterpreted by him. To begin with, he has attempted to read it wrong end foremost; his "obverse" and "reverse" should be transposed. The ostrakon is a letter from a rather illiterate husband to his wife, bidding her take good care of the children until he returns, assuring her that he will be responsible for any bills she may incur with the provision merchants for her maintenance, directing her what to do if unable to obtain supplies from them, promising to send her something, and charging her to be of good cheer and to be sure to tell him all about the baby. If, as Sayce affirms, the ostrakon "is in an unusually good state of preservation, every letter being legible on both obverse and reverse," he has published a singularly wretched photograph of the "obverse" side. But enough of it is legible to warrant the outline I have given, and to show that the ostrakon has no mention of the Passover.

כֶּהֱם in P. Not much should be made of this point, however, as the Aramaic עֲבִידָה is the exact equivalent of Hebrew מִלֵּאכָה. On the other hand, though P alone alludes to ridding the houses of leaven, the custom may well be older than P. But the question as between H and P need not be pressed.

To sum up, then, we have seen that this papyrus shows an attempt to impose upon the Jews of Egypt the observance of the feast of Unleavened Bread, not in the old Israelitish form of J or E, or even of the expanded D, but in the form prescribed by the priestly legislation. It is distinctly the post-exilic Jewish observance which is here enjoined. Whether the Jews of Elephantine had retained the old Canaanitish institution in a looser form since the days of Psammetik II, a hundred and seventy years before, we cannot tell. Probably they had not.²⁰

For the history of Old Testament literature it is to be noted that this papyrus affords the first conclusive evidence that the Holiness Code, at all events, had been composed before 419 B.C.²¹

One question remains, and that perhaps the most important; namely, as to the authority behind this promulgation of the feast of Unleavened Bread.

Sachau renders the third line of the papyrus, "Und nun in diesem Jahr, dem Jahr 5 des Königs Darius, ist von dem Könige an Arsames (die Botschaft) geschickt worden—," construing the passive participle שְׁלִיחַ as neuter and third person. He accordingly assumes that it is a Passover proclamation that has *been sent* from Darius to Arsames, and draws the consequent and far-reaching conclusions on the

²⁰ The tone of the Passover Papyrus seems to assume no knowledge of the institution on the part of the Jews of Elephantine. In this respect it is in marked contrast to the two letters concerning the feast of the Rededication of the Temple, addressed by the Jerusalem Jews to those of Egypt in the years 148 and 124 B.C., respectively, and preserved in the first chapters of 2 Maccabees. Compare Torrey, in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1900, pp. 225 ff.

²¹ There is, by the way, quite decisive proof that the Darius of this text is Darius II; see below, p. 29.

relations of the Persian kings to the Jewish religion. Darius will have sent a special embassy to the governor of Egypt for the express purpose of proclaiming the Passover festival to his Jewish subjects in that country. If to Egypt, then of course to his other provinces as well. But since he will hardly have dispatched such a legation for the purpose every year, Sachau concludes that Darius had been prevailed upon by some "Nehemiah" of his entourage to proclaim, or perhaps to authorize, the observance of the Passover where formerly it had been neglected or prohibited.

Incidentally, it is of course felt that this construction of the papyrus gives renewed support to the authenticity of the documents and narratives in the book of Ezra, which have been so much discredited in recent years.

Eduard Meyer hastens to speak of our papyrus as a "Regierungserlass"; affirms, on the basis of this document, that the feast of the Passover was proclaimed by royal decree of Darius II in the year 419 B.C. for the Jews of the whole empire; and concludes that Hananyah, having brought the royal decree to Egypt, now, by direction of Arsames, transmits it to the Jews of Elephantine. He declares "die Echtheit der Urkunden des Ezrabuches durch die neuen Funde in jedem Worte erwiesen." Further, "Aufs neue zeigt sich drastisch, dass das Judentum eine Schöpfung des Perserreichs ist: die babylonischen Juden haben eben die Autorität der Regierung in Bewegung gesetzt und durch sie das von Ezra verfasste Gesetz den Juden in Palästina und der Diaspora auferlegt." And he closes his discussion with the triumphant words, "Eine glänzendere Bestätigung und Ergänzung hätte die Darstellung im Buche Ezra-Nehemiah und die auf dieselbe begründete historische Anschauung nicht erhalten können, als sie dieser Osterbrief vom Jahre 419 v. Chr. gebracht hat."²²

On the other hand, Lidzbarski is not so certain of the royal meddling with the religious concerns of the Jews. He thinks that the official part of the document was limited to a royal ordinance for the New Year — whatever that may be

²² *L.c.*, pp. 1035, 1052 f.

—and that the details concerning the observance of the Passover were Hananyah's personal contribution. But as this latter involved absence from military duty during the seven days of the feast,²³ the government may have concerned itself with that aspect of the matter.

Now, in point of fact, we have neither the need nor the right to beat about the bush in this fashion. Either Eduard Meyer is entirely right, or he is entirely wrong. Either the Persian government had everything to do with the Passover celebration of our papyrus, or it had nothing whatever to do with it. The whole imposing edifice of Eduard Meyer's representation rests, like an inverted pyramid, upon the single point of the intended reference of the one word שלִיחַ in line 3 of the papyrus. If the papyrus had come down to us unharmed, we should have had in the six or seven words now lost, which followed the phrase מִן מַלְכָּא שְׁלִיחַ עַל אַרְשָׁם at the end of line 3 and the beginning of line 4, a complete answer to the question. Lacking those words, we must determine the reference indirectly as best we may. But that should not allow us to confuse the issue. Either the word שְׁלִיחַ refers to Hananyah himself, or it refers to the subject matter of his letter, the observance of the Passover. It cannot, as a matter of mere syntax, have referred to both. If it referred to Hananyah, there remains nothing in the papyrus to connect the Passover with the official mission of Hananyah. If it referred to the ordinance of the Passover, there remains nothing in the papyrus to connect Hananyah with a special royal mission on any subject. And as regards Lidzbarski's halting conclusions, if the subject matter of the papyrus, all of which relates to the details of the Passover observance, was not the subject of שְׁלִיחַ in the introductory sentence at line 3, we have no reason in the world for assuming another

²³ Lidzbarski's view that the papyrus directed the Jews of Elephantine to abstain from work during the entire seven days of the feast (*l.c.*, col. 2970), necessitating military leave of absence from the Persian authorities for that length of time, has no warrant either in the text of the papyrus or in the usage of Judaism from the earliest times to the present day. Moreover, it is difficult to see how the military duties of the Jews of Elephantine can have been so very strenuous in ordinary times.

neuter subject outside the existing contents of the papyrus, when the latter actually supplies us with Hananyah himself as the alternative.

On the purely linguistic merits of the two alternatives there is this to be said: שליח, though it might be used of a *dispatch*, would not be used of a royal *command, decree, or proclamation*. The substance of a royal ordinance concerning the Passover would certainly have been introduced with the words *מן מלכא שים טעם*, and not with *מן מלכא שליח על*. On the other hand, compare the technical language of the pretended rescript of Artaxerxes to Ezra in Ezr. 7 14-17, where the king says, *מן מלכא שליח . . . תקנא . . . thou shalt buy*, etc. And later, the Aramaic of *Apostle*, whether Christian or Jewish, is שליחא.²⁴

Now it can be shown from the contents of another papyrus, which Sachau did not decipher and interpret correctly, (1) that Hananyah was a Jew occupying a high official position in the government of Egypt; (2) that he was not Egyptian-born, but had only recently come into the country; and (3) that his activities immediately upon his arrival resulted in straining the relations of the Jews of Elephantine with their Egyptian neighbors to the point of serious trouble for a considerable period, before the destruction of their temple in the year 410 B.C.

In view of these facts, we have, I think, no course open to us but to interpret the word שליח, in line 3 of the Passover Papyrus, of Hananyah himself. *It was not a Passover proclamation, but Hananyah himself who was sent from Darius to Arsames, on some matter of state of which we have no further information.* And in this letter of his, written to the Jews of Elephantine soon after his arrival in Egypt, before proceeding with his directions for the observance of the national feast, he naturally tells them *who he is, and by what authority he speaks*: he is special ambassador from Darius II to Arsames, Persian governor of Egypt; and he speaks by the

²⁴ Because its context is as yet too obscure, I disregard the sentence *ואורחן ד מני שליח עליהם על ונה*, apparently, *and another person who was dispatched by me (Arsames) to them on this matter* (Sachau Papyrus 8, line 6).

authority — of course, *of the priests in Jerusalem, whom he had visited on his way.* It is difficult to see how any other supposition can be entertained while this one is open.

But this is not a mere supposition. The six or seven lost words between the end of line 3 and the middle of line 4 contained a statement regarding the visit to Jerusalem, with the verb in the first person singular of the perfect tense. Only so is the particular form of the date in the letter explainable or intelligible: *שְׁנָתָא זָא שְׁנַת חַמֵּשׁ חַמֵּשׁ דְּדָרְיוּשׁ*. *This year, the fifth year of Darius the King, I was sent or there was sent,* is not a natural expression. For an instantaneous act of that kind, we naturally demand either more circumstance or less. The Jews of Elephantine knew as well as Hananyah what year of Darius II they were then living in. If that were the burden of his statement, *this year* would have been sufficient, unless he went on to give the time of the year as well. Still less satisfactory, though syntactically more sound, is Lidzbarski's interpretation, *This year is the fifth year of Darius;*²⁵ but it is interesting as showing that at least one accomplished scholar feels there is something decidedly queer about the expression if interpreted as above. On the other hand, *This year, the fifth year of Darius the King, being sent from the King to Arsames, I visited the city of Jerusalem* (or something of that sort), is a perfectly natural sentence. The time of a sojourn in Jerusalem could very well be dated by the year alone. In other words, *שְׁנָתָא זָא* requires for its grammatical completion a finite verb of the purport I have assumed.

According to this interpretation, Hananyah, having been sent on a mission from Darius II to Arsames, traveled to Egypt by way of Palestine, and stopped over in Jerusalem in the 5th year of Darius II, receiving there the latest priestly

²⁵ *L. c.*, col. 2969. Lidzbarski accordingly assumes that Hananyah's letter is being written on the first day of the first month of the new year. But apart from the fact that the Jews of Elephantine seem to have managed to date their documents accurately enough without receiving information on the state of the calendar from the capital of the satrapy, Hananyah must have expected his letter to be received before the first day of Nisan, when he directed his readers to "count fourteen days."

regulations regarding the feast of Unleavened Bread, and doubtless much else besides. He arrived in Egypt during the same year, probably toward the end of it, and took the first occasion to enjoin upon his coreligionists at Elephantine the proper observance of the feast, in accordance with the Jerusalem law, in time for the celebration of the first month of the 6th year of Darius II (began April 15, 418 B.C.). Strictly speaking, then, the Passover Papyrus will have been written in that fraction of the 5th year of Darius II which fell in the year 418 B.C. (January to April 14).

Before passing on to the contents of the other papyrus to which reference has been made, it is to be noted that in this Passover letter Hananyah does not speak of himself as עֲנַנְיָה or עֲנַנְיָהִים , the form employed in addressing Yedonyah even by one of the latter's most prominent associates at the head of the community in Elephantine, but אַחִיכֶם , *your brother*. Hananyah, it is evident even from Papyrus 6, is at least the equal of Yedonyah, and almost certainly his superior, in station.

We turn now to the text of Sachau Papyrus 11. I have succeeded in piecing out all the important lacunæ, with a result which differs considerably from the tentative and fragmentary translation published by Sachau. Sachau supposed this document to be a letter of warning against two men who were about to visit Elephantine. It is, on the contrary, a strong letter of recommendation.

In order to make evident at a glance my construction and interpretation of the Aramaic text, I vocalize after the analogy of the Biblical Aramaic, from which, except for the latter's mutations of vowel-quality and excess of Masoretic refinement, the pronunciation of these Egyptian Jews of the fifth century B.C. will not have differed materially. As before, suppletory letters are bracketed, and seriously mutilated ones overlined.

TEXT OF PAPYRUS II

- 1 אֵל כָּרָא יִדְעִיה אֹרְיָה וְכִנְיָא וְ יִדְי אֵלְמָא כִּמְן בְּרַ יִשְׁבְּתָה וְנִרְיָה כִּר . 1 word .
- 2 עֲבִדְרַ מִצְוִיָּה : שְׁלָם כָּרָאֲנִי about 5 words לְרִתְמִן הִיִּי קִרְם
- 3 אֵלְמָה שְׁמִיָּא : פִּכְמַת כּוּי וִירְדַנְת רַב חֵילָא כִּמְסָא לֵאבֹוֹט אֲסִרְיַ עֲלִיכְרַ אֲבַנְגִּירַ וְ יִ
- 4 הַשְׁבִּיחוּ נִיבַב כִּדִּי וְרַבְלִיָּא : עַל אֲחִירַן צִחָא וְחִירַ עֲלִימִי עֲנִי אֲשִׁמְעִדִּי עִם וִירְדַנְת
- 5 וְחִירְטִפִּי כִּמְטָלְ אֵלְמָה שְׁמִיָּא עַד שׁוֹבוֹנִי : כִּמְן נָא אֲחִירַן תִּפְסָה עֲלִיכֹם : אֲנִיָּם חִוּוּ עֲלִיָּים
- 6 כִּה אֲבוּ : פִּפְסָה וְ יִ צִחָא יִבְעִיה מִנְכֹם אֲנִיָּם קָמוּ קִבְלָהֶם כֹּן כּוּי מִלְּהָ כֵאִישָׁה
- 7 לֹא יִהְשָׁבִחוּ לְכֹם : לְכֹם יִסְרָא וְ יִ חִנְיָם הִי עֲלִין כֹּן וְ יִ חֲנִיָּה כִּמְעִרְהִי עַד כִּמְן :
- 8 מִסָּה וְ יִ תְּעִבְדִּין לְחִירַ לְ[פִשְׁ]כֹם עֲבִדְרַ [אֲנִ]תְמִם : חִירַ עֲלִיָּים חֲנִיָּה : אֲנִיָּם וְגַלִּי כֹן כִּמְן
- 9 נִכְסִין לְקַבֵּל וְ יִ דִּבְמִם : מָה תִּסְרָמָא וְיָמָה וְ יִ לֹא תִסְרֹן כִּדִּי לְכֹם : מִנְךָ שְׁלַח אֲנִיָּה עֲלִיכֹם הִי
- 10 אֲמִיר לִי שְׁלַח אֲחִירַת כִּדְרִמְתִּין : [תִּן] לִי תִסְרֹן שִׁיבָא שִׁיָּם אֲחִירְוִי כִּבִּית עֲנִי : וְ יִ תִּעֲבְדִּין
- 11 לִּיה לֹא יִתְפַּסִּין מִן עֲנִי :
- 12 אֵל כָּרָא יִדְעִיה אֹרְיָה וְכִנְיָא וְיִרְיָמָא

TRANSLATION

- 1 To my lords Yedonyah, Uriyah, and the priests of the God Yahu, Mattan bar Yoshibyah and Neriyah bar
 2 Thy servant Mazuziyah: The welfare of my lords . . . [about 5 words] . . . [1 word] . . . Be ye favored before
 3 the God of Heaven. For the rest: When Waitdrang, the chief of the garrison, came to Abot, he put me in prison
 4 they found had been stolen by the traders. At last Seha and Hor, acquaintances of 'Anani, exerted themselves
 5 and Hornuuf, under the protection of the God of Heaven, until they delivered me. Now behold, they are about
 6 whatever their business may be. And whatever thing Seha or Hor may require of you, do you meet them in
 7 they may not find in you. You know the affliction which, for no reason at all, has rested upon us since Hananyah
 8 Whatever you do for Hor, you will be doing for your own selves. Hor is acquainted with Hananyah. Do you
 9 any goods that are at hand; whether we lose or whether we do not lose, never mind. This is why I am sending
 10 said to me, Send a letter ahead of us. Even if we should lose, a credit will be established because of him in the
 11 for him will not be hidden from 'Anani. house of 'Anani. What you do
 [Docket:] To my lords Yedonyah, Uriyah, and the priests, and the Jews.

Line 1. כהניא. The names which follow, Mattan bar Yoshibyah and Neriya, are those of the priests. There were accordingly but two priests attached to the Yahwè temple at Elephantine.

ידי of the papyri should be pronounced *Yáhu*, not *Yaho*, as Sachau and others. *Yaho* cannot be derived from *Yahwè*. The alternative of *Yáhu* is not *Yaho*, but *Yô*. The *Yeho*- of Masoretic proper names is fictitious, the *o*-vowel having been reached only after the elision of the ה in compounds: *yahu—yau—yo* spelled *y(h)o*. So the name Jonathan in the living language was *Yahunatan*, *Yaunatan*, or *Yônatan* (יְהוֹנָתָן), but never *Yehonatan* (יְהוֹנָתָן). Nor, on the other hand, should we allow ourselves to be misled by the Masoretic pronunciation of such Lamed-He forms as יְהוּ, for this was of course pronounced *hwaw* by the Jews of Elephantine. Finally, Sachau's supposition (p. 10) that יהוה of the Mesha stone may be intended for יהוה is entirely inadmissible; in the Mesha stone the ה is necessarily consonantal.

Line 2. עכרך. The singular suffix, if not a slip, probably has in mind Yedonyah alone, in spite of the plural address of the letter; for the others are not Ma'uziyah's superiors, as we shall see.

מעוזיה. On the identity of the writer see below, pp. 27 ff.

Line 3. פ in פכעת is the Arabic *fa*; it occurs again in lines 6 and 8, and in Sachau Papyrus 12 (not indexed); also in the Zenjirli, Nabatean, and Palmyrene inscriptions.

יידרנג, the commander of the garrison at Elephantine, effects the arrest at Abydos not necessarily because his military jurisdiction extended to that city, but probably because Ma'uziyah, as a member of the "army of occupation," was not subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the local magistracy. —It would be well if in our ignorance of the correct pronunciation of the name יידרנג, the euphonious *Waidrang* could be conventionally adhered to.

עלדבר אכנצרה, not "wegen eines Edelsteins, eines einzigen," as Sachau; the text is merely shorthand for אכנצרה אכנצרה; cf. אש חר a certain man, Sachau Papyrus 62, obv., col. 2, line 6.

Line 4. **השכחו נניכ ביד רכליא**. Sachau: "den man gefunden hat als gestohlen (gestohlenes Gut) in der Hand (im Besitz) von Kaufleuten." If that were the meaning, **ביד רכליא** would follow **השכחו**. Besides, if the stone was actually recovered from the merchants, the officials would have had little difficulty in tracing the thief. **רכליא** are not the local shopkeepers, but the visiting traders, to which class Ma'uziyah belonged. The stone may well have been purloined while being exhibited, together with other jewels, to a company of such traders, without leaving any trace of the individual thief. On **נניכ**, passive participle with the force of the pluperfect, cf. Nöldeke, § 278 B. For **ביד** of the agent cf. Syriac **ב**.

על אחרן. Sachau can make nothing of this. The phrase occurs also in Sachau Papyrus 52, col. 1, line 5: **על אחרן**; **זוכרני**, at last he will remember me; and col. 2, line 1: **עד ד על**: **אחרן** until at last. Lidzbarski (*l.c.*, col. 2978) renders it correctly enough *schliesslich*, but would read **על אחרן** in all three passages. The letter **ח**, however, is perfectly distinct and unmistakable in every case. The fact is, we have here the phrase which has hitherto baffled the efforts and ingenuity of the commentators on the Aramaic text of Dan. 4 5. The spelling **אחרין** of Dan. 4 5 proves, if any proof were needed, that the word has nothing to do with **אחרין** another; the transmitters could never have inserted that **י**, for the Kethib is at cross purposes with the Masoretic tradition, which could make nothing of it, and with the Qeri, which demands the spelling **אחרן**. On the other hand, the uniform spelling of the papyri, **על אחרן**, proves that the pointings suggested for Dan. 4 5 by Marti (*Bibl.-aram. Grammatik*, §§ 87c, 94b), **אחרין** or **אחרין**, as adverb in the one case and singular noun in the other, are alike impossible, for either form would be spelled **אחרין** in the papyri. For other counsels of despair, see the commentaries of Bevan and Kraetzschmar. We must accordingly point in harmony with both the Kethib of Dan. 4 5 and the spelling of the papyri, **אחרין**, absolute plural corresponding to the construct **אחרין** after,

and meaning (in the plural) *the end*; ²⁶ compare the Hebrew אַחֲרֵי הַחֲנִית (2 Sam. 2 23), which is not *the hinder end of the spear*, but merely *the end of the spear*, a rhetorical expression analogous to פִּי הַרֶבֶץ *the mouth (edge) of the sword*. In Dan. 4 5 accordingly we must read וְעַל אַחֲרָיו *and at last*; the על was corrupted to עד as a consequence of the erroneous interpretation "until another."

עֲלִימִי *acquainted with*, passive participle with reciprocal sense, cf. Nöldeke, § 280; not *servants of 'Anani*, as Sachau, which is impossible in this context. Seha and Hor are quite too important and influential to be anybody's "boys." Besides, the ordinary interpretation cannot be reconciled with line 8, where Hor is described as the עֲלִים of Hananyah. Sachau concludes that two different persons of the name Hor are mentioned in the papyrus. But even that bold remedy does not meet the substantial objection first mentioned. We must connect with עֲלִים *to know*, not with עֲלָמָא, *youth, servant*. Cf. Hebrew יָדוּעַ, and the expression רַדְיִים אֱלֹהִים *pious*, Sachau Papyrus 55, line 5 (Sachau transcribes erroneously רַדְיִמָן).

עֲנִי is without doubt the 'Anani alluded to in line 19 of the petition to Bagoas, Sachau Papyrus 1, where Ostanès is singled out for special mention among the nobles of Jerusalem to whom previous appeals had been directed: "Ostanès, the brother of 'Anani" can only mean that the writers are acquainted with 'Anani in Egypt and are not acquainted with Ostanès in Jerusalem. Very probably also, this 'Anani is identical with the official scribe or secretary of the chancellerie of Arsames, whom we meet in an original decree of the governor which has come down to us, Sachau Papyrus 8. This document is signed first in the hand which engrossed the body of it: עֲנִי סַפְרָא *'Anani the Scribe*; then follows in the same elegant hand the title בעל טַעַם *Master of decrees*,

²⁶ This use of the indeterminate plural in an abstract sense, with a value approaching that of our determinate singular, which occurs in the case of the Aramaic אֱלֹהִים as in that of the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, has not received sufficient recognition. In English I may say, "Grapes are a delicious fruit," or, "The grape is a delicious fruit"; but I may not say, "The grapes are a delicious fruit."

or *Chancellor*, introducing the signature of this last official, which was appended in another hand: כתב נבועקב *Neb'o'aqab has signed*. So, against Sachau, pp. 48 f., and Ed. Meyer, *l.c.*, p. 1036; compare מחסה בר י' [דניה] נפשה *Mahseyah bar Yedonyah has signed in person*, written in a handwriting distinct from that of the notary, Sayce-Cowley E, lines 17 f. The word ספרא which follows נבועקב in the fragment of the docket of Papyrus 8, has been robbed of its context, and may, for all we know, be *document*, and not *scribe*. The בעל טעם was, as in Ezra 4, the higher official of the two, and in this case an Aramean. Incidentally, this document shows us what the Passover Papyrus would have looked like, had it been even remotely connected with a royal rescript. Not merely would it have been officially countersigned, but the names of the superscription would be reversed, and the papyrus would begin מן חנניה על ידניה, if not indeed מן ארשם על ידניה, in the name of the governor.—For the rest, there is nothing in our Papyrus 11 to indicate that 'Anani was himself a resident of Abydos, where Ma'uziyah's misadventure occurred; on the contrary, had 'Anani been at Abydos, the services of Seha and Hor would not have been required.

Line 5. חרנופי was either the local Egyptian magistrate at Abydos or the plaintiff in the case.

חזו עליהם, not *be on your guard against them*, as Sachau; the expression occurs in the sense of solicitous attention in Sachau Papyrus 13, line 6: חזי על עלימא וביתי כו תעבד: *care for the young people and my house as thou wouldst do for thine own house*; also in the ostrakon published by Sayce, mentioned above, p. 13, note 19: חזי על ינקיא עד: *care for the children until we come*.

Line 6. חיר was omitted at first, and later written in over the line; hence יבעה in the singular.

קמו קבלהם כן *let your attitude to them be such*; כן *so*, modifying קמו.

Line 7. Second לכם, literally *you have = there is*. I have rendered *you know*.

יסירא, *punishment*. The reading of this word, which

Sachau gives up altogether, is quite certain; the only letter that is very seriously mutilated is the ך. Point after Marti, § 82, note 2.

חנים, Hebraism = חננים of the Old Testament; adverb, *gratuitously*. For the form חנים as a possible alternative of חננים compare Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 88 c. Sachau suggests the god-name Hnum = Hnub, the Egyptian god of Elephantine; but (1) the third letter, though mutilated, is distinctly a ך and not a ך, and (2) a proper name is out of place before the enclitic which follows.

ו, enclitic emphasizing the preceding word; see Nöldeke, § 221.

Line 8. לחור. The writer appears to have started by writing לחנ (for Hananyah), and then corrected to לחור.

לנפשכם עבדן. The ך in both words is unmistakable, though Sachau omits the one and reads the other ך; I think there can be no question as to the letters I have supplied.

עלים. See above on line 4.

וולי. The Pe'al is to be *cheap*. The context requires the Pa'il; cf. the Aph'el, "billig verkaufen" (Dalman).

בתין. The suffix refers to writer and readers combined; Ma'uziyah's goods at Elephantine are included.

Line 9. מיה חסרנא. literally, *what we may have lost or what we may not have lost, be alike to you*. Sachau transcribes מיה חסרן ויה חסרן ויה לא חסרן. The characters between the first מיה and לא are mutilated or blurred, but enough of them is visible to make certain that the papyrus had no ויה in the first clause and that a letter followed the ך of the first חסרן. In any case, the word cannot be the plural participle, referring to Seha and Hor, as Sachau and Lidzbarski (*l.c.*, col. 2980). The form and reference must be the same as in line 10, where חסרן cannot be construed as the participle or as referring to the visitors, only one of whom is there being spoken of; note the suffixes in אחריויה (line 10), ליה (line 11). On the idiom and the tense, cf. Nöldeke, § 258, and מיה צבוי in line 6 above.

Line 10. לוהן occurs Sachau Papyrus 53, line 3. On its use with the perfect in hypothetical sentences, cf. Nöldeke, §§ 259, 375.

שִׂמָּא. The א (for ה?) was omitted at the first writing, and inserted above the line.

שִׂמָּא. On the use of the participle for future time in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, see Nöldeke, § 271. שִׂמָּא שִׂמָּא, literally, *a treasure will be laid up*. I take this to be intended figuratively: "Anani will be put under obligation to us." Compare the Syriac versions of Matth. 6 19-20, where identically the same language is employed! Evidently the Syriac reproduced the original Aramaic logion of Jesus, and that in turn played upon an old Aramaic metaphor.

אֲחֵרָהּ, *after him*, that is, *after his visit*.

כְּבֵית עֲנַנִי must not be taken too literally; כְּבֵית = *apud* — *chez* 'Anani.

Ma'uziyah, the author of the above letter, was one of the most prosperous and well-educated members of the Jewish community at Elephantine, and second in importance only to Yedonyah. When he wrote, he was temporarily absent from home, at Abydos. This appears by comparing his letter, addressed to Yedonyah and Uriyah as the chief laymen in the community, with Sachau Papyrus 10, where a Jew in difficulties elsewhere appeals for aid to the Jews of Elephantine and addresses his appeal to "Yedonyah, Ma'uziyah, Uriyah, and the garrison."

Again, this Ma'uziyah appears in Sachau Papyrus 5 as one of the five prominent Jews dispatching an official petition (perhaps to the Persian governor in Egypt, before appealing to outsiders) for permission to rebuild the temple which has been destroyed. The petition must therefore be dated after 410 B.C., though probably before 407. The five men indicting it are: Yedonyah bar Gem(aryah), Ma'uzi bar Natan, Shema'yah bar Haggai, Hoshe' bar Yatom, and Hoshe' bar Natan. This Ma'uzi, second again to Yedonyah, is certainly identical with our Ma'uziyah, and here his surname is given as *bar Natan*.²⁷

²⁷ In Sachau's transcription of Papyrus 11, Ma'uziyah's letter to Yedonyah, there appears a memorandum scribbled by the recipients on the outside of the papyrus, which Sachau reads כְּמִסְדֵּי בַר צִמָּא . . . ך. The reading of the last word alone is indicated as uncertain. Unfortunately, hardly a trace of

Now we have several documents from Elephantine professedly written by the hand of this same Ma'uziyah bar Natan:

(a) Sayce-Cowley H, an act of release dated in the 4th year of Darius (420/419 B.C.), and written by the hand of Ma'uziyah bar Natan, as notary.

(b) Sayce-Cowley J, a quit-claim deed dated in the 8th year of Darius (416/415 B.C.), and written by the hand of Ma'uziyah bar Natan, as notary.

(c) Sachau Papyrus 34, a deed of gift of which the date has been lost, but in which the notary's name is given with even more precision as *Ma'uziyah bar Natan bar 'Ananyah*.²⁸

Papyrus 11, Ma'uziyah's letter from Abydos, which is in the same handwriting as that of the three documents just mentioned, was written some time after 419 B.C. (when Hananyah came to Egypt), but before 410 B.C. (when the temple was destroyed), and while Hananyah was still in the country. Note the formal mention of the priests of the temple in the address. Besides, it is not likely that that outrage would have been committed while Hananyah was in Egypt. He doubtless returned to the king long before 410 B.C. The letter should therefore be placed some three or four years after 419 B.C.

Still other papyri in these finds introduce us to the father of our Ma'uziyah on the one hand, and to his children on the other.

In Sayce-Cowley C and D, two deeds of the 6th year of Artaxerxes (459/458 B.C.), Ma'uziyah's father, Natan bar 'Anani, appears as a witness. In Sachau Papyrus 28, a

this legend can be discerned in the photographic reproduction. But I have no hesitation in affirming that an indorsement of this sort would not have set forth Ma'uziyah's surname, and that what was set down was *וְיָ כְהֵן* or *וְיָ כְהֵן*, *Ma'uziyah's letter about Seha*.

²⁸ Sachau calls attention to the similarity of the handwriting in this papyrus to that of the mutilated, but originally superior, second copy of the petition to Bagoas (Papyrus 2), and concludes that they belong to the same period. They do, as a matter of fact, belong to the same period, but it is the *kalam*s that are similar, not the handwritings. Papyrus 2 was very probably written by the hand which penned the memorandum Papyrus 3, in which case it will be the personal copy of the emissary of the Jews of Elephantine to Bagoas.

document of the 9th year of Artaxerxes (456/455 B.C.), Natan bar 'Anani is the notary, as also in Sayce-Cowley E, of the 19th year of Artaxerxes (446/445 B.C.), and still again in Sayce-Cowley G, of the 25th year of Artaxerxes (440/439 B.C.).

The sequence yielded by these documents—the father, Natan bar 'Anani, appearing as an adult witness in the 6th year of Artaxerxes, and the son, Ma'uziyah bar Natan bar 'Anani, acting as one of the leaders of the community after the 14th year of Darius—affords us more direct evidence than any which has thus far been adduced, that the Darius of the days of Yedonyah bar Gemaryah and of the Elephantine temple outrage was Darius II.

On the other hand, in the list of subscribers to the fund collected for the God Yahu (Sachau Papyrus 18), we find a brother of Ma'uziyah, Ahyo bar Natan bar 'Anani, and one of his sons, 'Anani bar Ma'uzi, with perhaps another, Meshullam bar Ma'uzi. Under the circumstances it is permissible to assume that this list, which is dated 5th year, but without the name of any king, is to be assigned to the 5th year after the expulsion of the Persians, which occurred about 404 B.C. Perhaps no king is mentioned because Amyrtæus had not yet succeeded in establishing himself firmly upon the throne of the Pharaohs. In that case, this great collection may well represent the money employed for the rebuilding of the temple of Yahwè, some seven or eight years after the petition to Bagoas.

Finally, a Natan bar Ma'uziyah, who appears in an undated papyrus (Sachau 20), is certainly the son of our Ma'uziyah bar Natan.

I have called attention to the demonstrable prosperity, education, and importance of this Ma'uziyah bar Natan, because of the deferential, almost obsequious tone in which his letter to Yedonyah refers to the person of Hananyah. It is clear that the latter was one to whose favor both he and Yedonyah earnestly aspired. And though they recognized him as the cause, or at least the occasion of their embarrassment, there was no thought of resentment or oppo-

sition, but only of continued compliance with his will and ministering to his good pleasure. I think I detect a slight difference of attitude even from that exhibited toward 'Anani, the secretary of the Persian government. From 'Anani, Ma'uziyah expects a *quid pro quo* of a commercial kind; he will return their favors in due season. Of Hananyah nothing so definite seems to be expected. It is the bare favor of an exalted personage that is involved, one who can easily do harm if he will. Moreover, Hananyah is "in Egypt"—obviously at the seat of government, and a national figure. And, as already pointed out, he is a foreign Jew, who has but recently come into the country. It can no longer be disputed that the interpretation I gave of line 3 of the Passover Papyrus is correct. It was Hananyah himself who was *sent* from Darius to Arsames, and the Passover was his private concern.

One is tempted to speculate as to the character of the tantalizing "difficulty" which Hananyah's presence in Egypt had brought upon his coreligionists at Elephantine. Clearly it was of a kind that adverse reports by Seha and Hor concerning them might help to augment. Did Hananyah bring with him a religious exclusiveness and Levitical zeal which interfered with their traditional worship, disturbed the even tenor of their pagan ways, and put an end for the time being to their cordial relations with their neighbors? Did he find them Judeans, and try to make them Jews?

Sachau has called attention to the identity in name of this Persian official and the brother of Nehemiah, Hanani = Hananyah, upon whose moving report of conditions in Jerusalem, Nehemiah was impelled to undertake his work of restoration. Hananyah was not an uncommon name, to be sure. But Jews occupying exalted positions at the Persian court cannot have been so very numerous at any time; and such Jews bearing the name of Hananyah were doubtless fewer still. It is not at all unlikely that the Egyptian papyrus have introduced us once more to the brother of Nehemiah. If this be the same man, the date of Nehemiah is settled beyond all controversy, as of Artaxerxes I, not II. For we

can well suppose that Hananyah had traveled from Jerusalem to Susa, when a very young man at the Persian court, twenty-five years before he was appointed ambassador to Arsames; whereas it is well-nigh impossible to assume that he did so thirty-six years after he had attained to that dignity, and found his brother Nehemiah in the prime of life.

In any event, we have as little reason for connecting Darius II with the religious motives of Hananyah, as we have for identifying Artaxerxes with those of Nehemiah. And the Passover Papyrus gives us a picture, not of the Persian Empire espousing the cause of Yahwè and busying itself with the details of "Ezra's" ceremonial law, but of the new-born Judaism in Jerusalem reaching out to reform and to control the half-heathen Judeans of the Diaspora.

In conclusion, I venture to add a few words regarding the view which has been energetically revived since the discovery of the Elephantine papyri, and recently defended by Torrey,²⁹ to the effect that Judaism offered, on principle, no opposition to the establishment of sacrificial temples *ad libitum* outside of Palestine. Against that view it must be urged that not only do we actually know of but one such temple in the days when Judaism had come into its own, but the form of the Mishnic reference³⁰ to the temple of Leontopolis clearly shows that the latter was in fact the only one in existence in those days. The evidence of the well-informed priest Josephus is distinctly to the same effect, and incidentally contradicts the above-mentioned hypothesis as to the general attitude of Judaism on the theoretical question. Josephus manifestly had never heard of the "foreign soil" justification of the temple of Onias; which makes it hard to believe that it was anywhere entertained. In the next place, it must be remembered that the establishment of that single foreign temple was due not to religious necessities, but, like that of the Samaritans, to personal ambition, or at all events to personal vicissitudes. Circumstances rendered it innocuous to

²⁹ *Ezra Studies*, pp. 315 ff.

³⁰ Menahoth, 13 10.

the centralizing spirit of Judaism, and it was first tolerated and then grudgingly recognized. This much it owed to the accident of its location outside of Palestine — and outside of Alexandria. A richly endowed Aaronic monastery rather than a rival metropolitan see, it was not forced, in self-defense, to question the primacy or the legitimacy of the parent sanctuary at Jerusalem. But all this lies aside from the main point, which is, that the developed Jewish system, in contrast to the pre-Deuteronomic religion — which latter we must not make the mistake of supposing ceased to exist after 621 B.C. — had no need of more than one temple, any more than it had need of more than one tabernacle. It was not the accessibility or the location of the sanctuary, but the unity of the “congregation” and the vicariousness of the ritual that constituted the characteristic note of the priestly law. And if, as Wilrich maintains,³¹ the temple of Onias was founded by an émigré High Priest at a time when Jerusalem was in the hands of the heathen and inaccessible, the act was more at variance with the somewhat antiquated burden of Deuteronomy than with the spirit of the Levitical law. In any case, it is impossible to imagine a temple being founded outside of Palestine under the auspices and with the approval of the Jerusalem priesthood, merely to meet the religious needs of the Diaspora.

On the other hand, there may well have been other Yahwè temples besides that of Elephantine, founded by the earliest emigrants from Judea, which were *survivals of pre-Deuteronomic Yahwism*. These the Jews of Jerusalem will have countenanced in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., for much the same reasons that led their successors to countenance the temple of Leontopolis. It was a choice between easy, almost insensible compromise and irreparable schism. Such temples were theoretically illegitimate, but the question of their legitimacy was never a pressing one. What is more important, they were fundamentally incompatible and practically superfluous. It was not necessary to strangle them; they died a

³¹ *Juden und Griechen*, pp. 126 ff.

natural death with the spread of the new Judaism, the Synagogue, and the Mosaic law. When once the earliest settlers in Egypt learned to believe that the sacrifices at Jerusalem availed for all Palestine, they were quite content to have them avail for all Egypt too, and taxed themselves accordingly. The temple of Leontopolis remains an accident. And if there were any other sacrificial cults of Yahwè in out of the way corners of the earth at the beginning of the Christian era, they certainly lacked the "Aaronic" priesthood and were distinctly irregular. The ceremonial law of Judaism paradoxically carried with it the death sentence of sacrifice as an essential of Jewish religious life.

Beelzebul

W. E. M. AITKEN

COURTRIGHT, ONTARIO

THE name Beelzebul, as is well known, occurs in the Synoptic Gospels, and is there applied to the chief of the demons. In the following pages its meaning will be discussed and its use. First, the question of the correct form of the word will be considered, and the contexts in which the name occurs examined. Then I propose to show that in New Testament times the word *zebul* was used specifically of heaven, and that, inasmuch as in each of the important non-Jewish religions of the period one god held a preëminent place, and he a sky-god, and a foreign god was considered by the Jews to be a demon, the name Beelzebul—*i. e.* Lord of Heaven—was properly applied to the chief of the demons.

The word Beelzebul, with variants, is found in Mt. 10 25 12 24. 27, Mk. 3 22, Lk. 11 13. 18. 19. Our first concern is to satisfy ourselves about the actual form of the word. The evidence¹ that I submit will show that the reading *βεελζεβούλ* is supported by the most important witnesses, and that the deviations from that reading are entirely explicable.

The Greek Mss. almost without exception read *βεελζεβούλ*.²

¹ Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1869; Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Latine*, 1889 ff.; Pusey and Gwilliam, *Tetraevangelium . . . simplex syrorum versionem*, 1901; Lewis, *Old Syriac Gospels*, 1910; Ciasca, *De Tatiani Diatessaron Arabice Versione*, 1883; Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, 1868; Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 1904; Robinson, "Ephraim's Citations from the Diatessaron," in J. H. Hill's *Earliest Life of Christ*, 1894.

² A few read *βελζεβούλ*; B K (except Mk. 3 22) *βεελζεβούλ*. These variants are not important for our purpose; with the latter might be compared *beizebul* in *g*¹ and בעזלקרר (Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, no. 54, l. 1 f.), בעשמו (Corpus Inscrip. Sem., i. 1. 139, 1), [ב]טנא (CIS, i. 2. 869, 3), בעשמין (CIS, ii. 1. 163 C), [ב]טש (CIS, ii. 1. 176).

This is supported by most of the Old Latin Mss. (*a, f, ff¹, g; k, d, h* read *belzebul*; *b, velz.*), by some of the Syriac versions, and by the Armenian, Ethiopic, Gothic, Coptic (*belz.*), and others. The Vulgate reads *beelzebul*. This reading has influenced later scribes, with the result that it has been introduced into a few of the Mss. of the Old Latin; but it causes no difficulty, for Jerome has explained that the word means "habens muscas, aut devorans muscas, aut vir muscarum," and that on that account it is to be read *beelzebul*, and not *beelzebul*.³ The Peshitta with the Sinaitic and the Cureton Syriac support the reading *beelzebul*; while *syr^p* (Tischendorf), the Commentary of Ephraim on the Diatessaron, and the Diatessaron in Arabic⁴ support *beelzebul*.⁵ This evidence suggests that the Diatessaron read *beelzebul*.⁶ It is demonstrable that the Syriac version has been influenced in other places by the Old Testament Peshitta⁷; in the light of what we know concerning the reading of the Vulgate that is most probably the case here. Some fragments of homilies in Syriac⁸ and a few Latin Mss. read *beelzebud*. An entirely adequate explanation of this is that it is due to a corruption originating in a Greek uncial Ms. (Δ for Λ).

The passages of the New Testament that bear on the question of Beelzebul are Mt. 9 34, 10 24 f., 12 24-28, Mk. 3 22-26, Lk. 11 15-20. Jesus had been exorcising demons; opponents of his of the Pharisaic party offered an explanation of the phenomenon. They said that Jesus had Beelzebul, and that through him, the chief of the demons, he was working his wonders. Jesus, to show the weakness of the Pharisaic

³ *Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis — de Joanne, s.v. 'Beelzebul'*; cf. also his Commentary on Matt. 10 25.

⁴ Codex Fuldensis follows in general the order of the Diatessaron, but gives the text in accordance with the Vulgate.

⁵ Gwilliam records a reading on the margin of a Jacobite Ms. of the twelfth or thirteenth century, *B'el d'vuv*. This is probably nothing but a textual error; it might be due to the Syriac word *debâbâ* = fly, or possibly (?) to עֲבָבָא = enmity, as an interpretation (see below, p. 51 f.).

⁶ So Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. p. 205.

⁷ Burkitt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 204, 289, et al.

⁸ *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series*, vol. i. pt. ix. p. 73.

explanation, pointed out what befalls a kingdom, or a city, or a house, that is divided against itself. In like manner, he said, "if Satan hath risen up against himself and is divided, he cannot stand." "If I by Beelzebul," he retorted, "cast out demons, by whom do your people cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of God is come upon you." At another time he said to his disciples: "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple to be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the *master of the house* Beelzebul, how much more them of his household!"

In seeking a satisfactory explanation of the name Beelzebul, it is most natural to consider that it is a real name that has been applied to and is descriptive of the chief of the demons. Our first care is the word *zebul*, and we shall find that in addition to its ordinary meaning 'dwelling,' it was used, in the period with which we are concerned, specifically of the *dwelling of God*, both of the temple in Jerusalem and of heaven.

In Rosh ha-Shanah 17 *a* we read: שפשו דיהם זבול שנאמר מזבול לו ואין זבול אלא בית המקדש שנאמר בנה בניתי: . . . "because they stretched their hands out against the *zebul*, for it is written מזבול לו (Ps. 49 15; cf. Rashi and Ibn Ezra); and there is no *zebul* except the Temple, for it is written: I have built thee a *bêth zebul*" (1 Ki. 8 13). This proves conclusively that זבול was used by itself of the temple in Jerusalem. Similar passages found in Jer. Berachoth, ix. 1 (Zitomir ed., fol. 56 *b*), Ruth R. קמן ונרוי (Warsaw ed., 1725, p. 30 *b*), and Tosefta Sanhedrin 13 5 (ed. Zuckerman 434 26 *f*).

In the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, c. 37, in a passage which is attributed to Rabbi Meir, a pupil of Akiba, a list of the seven heavens is given: זילון, רקיץ, שחקים, זבול, מעון, מכוון, and ערבות. In Hagigah 12 *b* the list of the seven is given with a description of each. Zebul is that one in which are situated Jerusalem and the temple and the altar; beside the altar the great prince Michael stands and offers sacrifice.

The other six heavens are similarly described, and the descriptions are accounted for by texts. וילון (Latin, *velum*) is said to be the דֶק of Is. 40 22; רקיע is derived from Gn. 1 17; שחקים comes from Ps. 78 23, where it is parallel to שמים; מעון is from Dt. 26 15; מכון from 1 Ki. 8 39; ערכות is deduced from the parallelism of Ps. 68 5 and Dt. 33 26.⁹

The two passages quoted in connection with *zebul* are 1 Ki. 8 13 and Is. 63 15:

זֶה אָמַר לִשְׁכַּן בְּעַרְפֵּל בְּנֵה בְּנֵי יְבִית בֵּית וּבֵל לֶךְ
מִכּוֹן לִשְׁבַתְךָ עוֹלָמִים

and

הַבַּיִת מִשְׁמַיִם וְרָאָה ¹⁰ מִזְבֵּל קִרְשׁ וְתַפְאֵרְתְּךָ

These show that by *zebul* was understood both the temple and heaven. They also show whence this particular usage was ultimately derived. There are two other passages that have been influential in this direction — Hab. 3 11 and Ps. 49 15:

שֶׁמֶשׁ יָרַח עִמָּד וּזְבֻלָּה

and

וְצוּרִים לְבָלוֹת שְׂאוֹל מִזְבֵּל לוֹ

Ibn Ezra's comment on the first of these passages is: כל אחד זבול אחד; מהם עמד וזבולו "stands," i.e. ceases to shine¹¹ in the *zebul*.¹² שמש is prob-

⁹ There is also in the same place mention of a discussion whether there were two or seven heavens; Rabbi Jehudah concluded from Dt. 10 14 that there were only two, while ר"ל (who Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, vol. ii (1890), p. 65, n. 3, thinks was Simon b. Lakish, or perhaps Rabbi Levi) held that there were seven. Those who held to the seven differed among themselves as to their contents. The Slavonic Secrets of Enoch, c. 3 ff., and the Testament of Levi, c. 3, both give descriptive lists differing from each other and from the Talmudic list.

¹⁰ This can only be translated: "from thy holy and glorious 'zebul,' " whatever 'zebul' is. The ordinary translation, "from the dwelling of thy holiness and glory," must mean from the dwelling place of thy holiness, etc., i.e. thy holy dwelling.

¹¹ Cf. Jonah 1 15, Josh. 10 13.

¹² Alongside of זבולה I should like to place מענה in the following passage from Deut. 33 26 r.: אלֵּיךָ קָרָם וּמִזִּיחֵיךָ יִדְעֵת עוֹלָם: There is none like the God of Jeshurun, Who rideth through the heavens to thy help, And in his majesty through the skies. In heaven is the God of old, But underneath are the everlasting arms.

ably to be taken with the preceding verb. The other passage has presented difficulty to commentators. Our chief interest is to know how the later Jews understood it, and this is clear. The Targum, followed by Rashi, has taken לו מִזְבֵּל to mean 'because they stretched out their hands against the temple to destroy it.' This interpretation is also found in the Talmud and the Tosefta,¹³ and I think in all probability it is correct, the last few words being an annotation. We may note in passing that Rabbi Jonah, quoted by Ibn Ezra, understood *zebul* in this passage as heaven, for he says, "the judgment of heaven is on every one."

I took it for granted above that the ordinary meaning of *zebul* was dwelling, and of this there is little doubt. That is the meaning given by Abu'l-Walid and Kimḥi in their dictionaries. Rashi has understood it so on Gn. 30 20, 2 Ch. 6 2, Hab. 3 11, Ps. 49 15; Ibn Ezra on Gn. 30 20, Is. 63 15, Ps. 49 15; likewise the Targum on Gn. 30 20, Is. 63 15, Hab. 3 11, Ps. 49 15. This meaning is quite suitable in 1 Ki. 8 13 and Gn. 30 20. In the one case it is a more or less poetic expression, for which Rashi (on 2 Ch. 6 2) gives the prosaic מְדוּר. One might compare Ps. 26 8,

יהוה אֲדַבְרֵתִי מֵעֵין בֵּיתְךָ
וּמְקוֹם מִשְׁכַּן כְּבוֹדְךָ

with 1 Ki. 8 13,

בָּנָה בְּנִיתִי בַּיִת וְזָבַל לְךָ
מִכּוֹן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ עוֹלָמִים

In the other case it is probable that an etymology has been forced for the occasion from a denominative verb. There is no reason to suppose that the Greek translators were better acquainted with peculiar Hebrew words than the later Jewish commentators. The Greek of Gn. 30 20 (*αἰπεριεῖ*) may well be nothing more than a good guess or a free translation.¹⁴

¹³ Rosh ha-Shanah, 17 a. T. Sanhedrin, 13 ε (ed. Zuckerman, 434. 26 f.).

¹⁴ The theory of Guyard (*Journal Asiatique*, vii. 12, p. 220 ff.), which was accepted by Fried. Delitzsch (*Heb. Lang.*, p. 38) and Franz Delitzsch (*Comm. on Genesis*, on 30 20) that the root idea of the word is "height" does not carry conviction, nor has it won assent. Cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xv.

This makes it clear that *zebul* was understood specifically of the dwelling of God, whether that was thought of as the temple on earth or the heavens; in later ages when the temple had long disappeared it was still used of heaven. The poets of the eleventh and twelfth centuries of the Christian era frequently use the word in this way. The Spanish poet, Shelomo ibn Gabirol (d. c. 1058), wrote as follows (44. 1 f.)¹⁵:

שחך וּבִלְהֵמוֹן וּבֹל לְאֵל מְסֻלוֹתֵם יְרֵמוֹן
תִּבְל יִשְׁבִי כִּה לְמוֹל יִזְכְּרֵם פְּנִיָּהֶם הֵם יִשְׁימוֹן

Bahya ibn Pekūdā (first half of 11th cent.) has used the word in the same way (54. 5):

הֵמוֹן מִים וְשָׁמַיִם וְאָרֶץ יִקָּר יְרֵחַ וְאוֹר עֶמֶד וּבְלָה

Ibn Ezra (d. 1167) bears the same testimony (135. 27):

בְּרֵאשִׁית וּבֵל קָרָא וְאָרֶץ עֶמֶדָה מְהֵרָה

and again (132. 20 f.):

וּמְרוֹמוֹ יִתֵּן קוֹלוֹ שֶׁרָף בְּכֶם וּבְלוֹ

One more example may be cited, this from Yosef ibn Zebara (beginning of 13th cent.) (148. 26):

פְּתִיבִי אֵשׁ טָסִים בְּשֵׁשׁ כְּנָפַיִם בְּרוֹם וּבְלָךְ

There is little reason for thinking that the emphasis was placed much differently in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, or that at that time the temple was immediately associated with the idea of 'dwelling of God.' Of course a prophet might say:

Yahwe is in his holy temple,

Let all the earth keep silence before him (Hab. 2 20),

and the suppliant at the Jerusalem temple might cry:

He heard my voice in his temple,

And my cry came into his ears (Ps. 18 7).

729; and Halévy, *Revue des Études Juives*, 1885 a, p. 299; 1887 a, p. 148. The Greek translation of Gn. 30 20 which is entirely explicable, and the Assyrian usage, which seems still to be uncertain, are not sufficient grounds for this conclusion.

¹⁵ These examples are taken from Brody u. Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Dichterschule*, 1905. The figures give the number of the poem and the line.

Isaiah, in vision, had seen the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lofty, and his train filled the temple — but it was the heavenly temple (Is. 6 1). Jeremiah warned his people against worshiping the temple, against crying: “the Temple of Yahwe, the Temple of Yahwe, the Temple of Yahwe are these” (7 4). And this deeper note is frequent; 586 succeeded 701:

Yahwe is in his holy temple,
Yahwe — his throne is in the heavens (Ps. 11 4).

“Doth God really dwell on earth? Behold the heavens and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less the house that I have built!” (1 Ki. 8 27 = 2 Ch. 6 18). “Who is able to build him a house, seeing the heavens and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him?” (2 Ch. 2 6). “Heaven is my throne, and the earth my footstool, what kind of house will ye build unto me? Or what kind of a resting place?” (Is. 66 1).

The New Testament presents the same picture. Men went in and out of the temple; there the teachers taught, the people worshiped. But “the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet. The heaven is my throne, and the earth the footstool of my feet” (Acts 7 48 f.). “The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands” (Acts 17 24). “And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof” (Rev. 21 22). Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. This explains why when the temple disappeared nothing happened.

I have presented facts to show that *zēbul* means ‘dwelling,’ and *par excellence* the dwelling of God — heaven; but that does not complete the discussion of the word. There are a considerable number of traces of its use as the name of a god. These are found in very different places and at very different times.

An officer of Abimelech bore the name זְבֻל (Ju. 9 28. 30. 38. 41). “When a personal or geographical name is a single

noun, it may be the name of a divinity."¹⁶ A name, at the basis of which is our word *zebul*, was given to one of the Israelite tribes; this was written זבולן, זבולין, and once זבולון in the Hebrew text, and is probably to be pronounced זבולון. The Greek version, which is our oldest authority for the pronunciation of the word, represented it by *Σαβουλών*; inasmuch as it distinguishes ון and וין this is of considerable importance. The adjective formed from זבולן is זבולני (Jn. 12 11. 12, Nu. 26 27). If Zebulon is the correct pronunciation, it is probably a diminutive like אישון, עפרון, ענלן, ענלן, ענלן, ענלן (cf. 'Obaid) and שמשון (cf. Sumais).¹⁷ The name of the wife of Ahab, whom we know as Jezebel, is written in the Hebrew text איזבל. The traditional pronunciation is in all probability due to the fact that in it was recognized the word זבל (dung); but there is little doubt that that part of the name is a perversion of our *zebul*, and it may be that the whole word is the equivalent of זבולין, as some have thought.¹⁸ We do find איצור Nu. 26 30 = אביצור Ju. 6 34 *et al.*, and there we do not have to think of textual corruption. I should then compare it with such names as אביאל, אביבעל, אביהו, אחיהו, אחימלך, אחימלך, אחימלך. In an inscription of the fourth century B.C. from Kition, mention is made of a woman whose name is שמזבל.¹⁹ With this might be compared one in which Astarte is called שם בעל.²⁰ Another inscription²¹ contains a name of which זבל is an element; it has been transliterated as follows: קבר בעל אובל. The photographic reproduction is anything but clear, but clear enough to show that the copy is not an exact one. From what can be seen of the

¹⁶ H. P. Smith in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, i. p. 49.

¹⁷ See Nöldeke, *Ency. Biblica*, "Names," § 77.

¹⁸ Ewald, *Lehrbuch d. Hebr. Sprache*, ed. 7, 1863, iii. § 273, n. 1; cf. Fürst, *Handwörterbuch*, 1857, s.v. איזבל. The latter interprets it (s.v. זביל) Herr der Himmelsburg = ב' שמים = ב' טען.

¹⁹ Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 21. 4; cf. Nöldeke, *Ency. Biblica*, "Names," § 39.

²⁰ Cooke, *op. cit.*, 5. 18.

²¹ *CIS*, no. 158.

א of בעלאובל it cannot be said to resemble very closely the other two א's in the same inscription; it resembles the ת of אשת just as closely, and that reading would be explicable.²² A proper name, Zabullus, finally, is found on an altar dedicated to the Dii Manes in the walls of an old mosque at Tremesen.²³ After this accumulation of evidence there can be little doubt that Zebul was also a name applied to a god.

For all that has been said regarding the usage of זבול, there is a complete parallel in מעון. This word is used of a lair of jackals (Jer. 9 10, 10 22, 49 33, 51 37), or a den of lions (Nah. 2 12), with the general idea of habitation. It is used of the dwelling place of Yahwe, both of the temple on earth (Ps. 26 8, 2 Ch. 36 15) and in a general way of heaven (Dt. 26 15, Zech. 2 17, Ps. 68 6, 2 Ch. 30 27). In a similar way Yahwe is said to be the *mā'ōn* of his people (Ps. 90 1; cf. 71 3, 91 9):

אדוני מעון אתה היית לנו בדר דדר

Like *zebul* it is the name in Rabbinical literature of one of the heavens — the fifth²⁴; and in medieval poetry is a designation of heaven itself.²⁵ What idea was associated with the use of *mā'ōn* as the dwelling of God is a question raised by Dt. 33 27: כתיב מענה וני אין אנו יודעין אם הקביה מעונו של עולם, and is answered as follows: ²⁶ ואם עולמו מעונו מן מה דכתיב ²⁷ ה' מעון וני הוי הקביה מעונו של עולם ואין עולמו מעונו: Like *zebul* again it was a place name: בית בעל מעון,²⁸ בית מעון,²⁹ or בית בעל מעון,³⁰ or בית מעון.³¹

²² There is a name on one of the ostraka recently found by the Harvard Expedition at Samaria that is written בעלעובר.

²³ *Corpus Inscript. Lat.*, viii. 9947, on which see Shaw, *Travels*, ed. 3, 1808, p. 68. In viii. 5987, a part of the same name is found.

²⁴ Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, c. 37; Hagigah, 12 b.

²⁵ Brody u. Albrecht, *op. cit.*, no. 16, l. 21; no. 34, l. 3. Cf. מבון, no. 34, l. 7. It seems to be so used in Dt. 33 27; see n. 12.

²⁶ Bereshith R., 68, 67 c (Levy).

²⁷ Ps. 90 1, דדר דדר, אהה היית לנו בדר דדר.

²⁸ Shabbath, 139 a.

²⁹ Jer. 48 23; Jer. Erub. v. (Zitomir ed. 26 b).

³⁰ Nu. 32 38, Ez. 25 9, 1 Ch. 5 a.

³¹ Jos. 13 17, Tosefta, ed. Zuckerman, 71. 23.

From this it may be inferred that it was also the proper name of a god, though in what sense it was used we cannot tell any more than we could in the case of Zebul.

Zebul is heaven; Beelzebul is lord of heaven. With these facts decided we may proceed at once to the solution of the problem. It was the Pharisees who used the name; Beelzebul was chief of the demons; the gods of the nations were considered by the Jews to be demons; in each of the prominent religions of the period one god held a preëminent place, and he was a sky-god—these are the considerations on which the solution will be based.

The Pharisees, Matthew tells us, were the people who said that Jesus was casting out demons by Beelzebul, the chief of the demons; according to Mark it was the scribes who came down from Jerusalem—who in this case were in all probability of the Pharisaic party. These people were the makers as well as the observers of tradition. They were students and teachers of the Bible who represented the observant and progressive side of Judaism—the advocates of the new religion. They are the people from whom we may look for some information on the subject of demonology.³²

Beelzebul is chief of the demons; that is plain from the gospel narrative—“this man doth not cast out demons but by Beelzebul, the prince of the demons.”³³ It is necessary to see what was meant by ‘chief of the demons,’ and whence a ‘chief of the demons’ might come. The later Jewish demonology was composite in structure; its materials were drawn from all accessible sources. Natural developments at home were combined with borrowings from abroad; and the organization of it all was certainly a gradual and not necessarily a logical process.³⁴

Satan was a product of Jewish history. At one time an officer of the celestial court, he later became the representative of all that was evil, appropriating the functions and the

³² See *Ency. Biblica*, “Scribes and Pharisees,” § 6 f.

³³ Mt. 12 24; cf. 9 34, also Mk. 3 22, Lk. 11 15.

³⁴ Cf. Toy, “Evil Spirits in the Bible,” *JBL*, 1890, p. 17 ff.

names of various other prominent evil and supernatural beings, the evolution of the idea associated with him keeping pace with the development of Jewish angelology and demonology.³⁵ In a somewhat similar fashion the impulse to evil that is in man from his youth (Gn. 8 21) was personified; the *Yeser ha-Ra'* joined the number of the demons, and before long it was said³⁶ that Satan, *Yeser ha-Ra'*, and the Angel of Death³⁷ were one and the same. Belial is another of the important demons. In the early Hebrew literature this word is found chiefly in such expressions as בני כליעל, "vile scoundrels,"³⁸ in later literature by a natural development it has become a proper name which is applied to the chief of the demons.³⁹

The general state of affairs may be illustrated very well from the New Testament. In it there is frequent mention of demons or unclean spirits. Among these powers there is one that is regarded as chief—*ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων*. He is ordinarily known as *Σατανᾶς* or *ὁ Σατανᾶς*, *Διάβολος* or *ὁ Διάβολος*; but many other designations are also employed: *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, *ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἄερος*, *ὁ ἄνομος*, *ὁ πειράζων*, *ὁ ἐχθρός*, *ὁ πονηρός*, *βελίαρ*, *ὁ ὄφεις*, *ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος*, *ὁ δράκων*. The number caused no difficulty whether they were regarded as epithets or real names; on occasion several of them were used side by side: *ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας*, *ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος*, *ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς*, *ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην* (Rev. 12 9).

The demons that we have discussed so far, demons that came to be known as 'chief' demons, were the result of native development, though there is little room for doubt that this development was fostered by foreign influence, especially by that of Babylonia and Persia. In addition to this external influence on the development of native Jewish

³⁵ Cf. Blau, *Jewish Ency.*, s.v. "Satan," p. 69 a.

³⁶ By Simon b. Lakish, Baba Batra, 16 a.

³⁷ Cf. 1 Chr. 21 15, 2 Ki. 19 35, 2 Sam. 24 15.

³⁸ Moore, *Judges*, p. 417; cf. also p. 419.

³⁹ Ascension of Isaiah, 2 4 4 2; and many passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

demonology there is to be observed a certain direct dependence on foreign religions — on the one hand, a direct borrowing from the foreign religion; on the other, explanations necessitated by the very existence of these religions.

Direct borrowing from a foreign religion, naturally rare, may be illustrated by Asmodeus,⁴⁰ the great demon of whom we learn chiefly in the book of Tobit. Whatever be the correct explanation of this name, there seems no longer room for doubt that in origin he was the great representative of evil in the Parsee religion, and that he was borrowed and "modified by the sovereign will of the popular imagination," and made into a chief of the demons⁴¹ for the Jews.

The other phase of direct dependence is more apparent. Hebrew religion had not advanced very far before it was necessary to explain the fact of foreign religion and foreign worship. Different explanations of the fact could be given, and were given. Yahwe might be considered the God of the Hebrews, and a foreign god the god of the foreign people concerned — the opinion of monolatrous theology. Or it might be said that a god of a foreign people was no god at all. On the other hand, it was possible to associate the two gods as the same god under different names. Origen in combating this view illustrates it. He says it is wrong for Christians to call God Zeus, that they are to be defended when they struggle even to the death to avoid calling God by this name or by a name from any other language.⁴² He discusses the question further: *νομίζουσι μηδὲν διαφέρειν, εἰ λέγοι τις· σέβω τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἢ τὸν Δία ἢ Ζῆνα, καὶ εἰ φάσκοι τις· τιμῶ καὶ ἀποδέχομαι τὸν ἥλιον ἢ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ τὴν σελήνην ἢ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ γῆ πνεῦμα ἢ τὴν Διμήτραν καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα φασὶν οἱ Ἑλλήνων σοφοί.*⁴³ I suppose this was the course the Hellenists at the time of the Maccabæan struggle and later had to pursue unless they were prepared to give up their own religion altogether.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ See Cheyne, *Ency. Biblica*, s.v.

⁴¹ Called so in Git. 68 a; Pesach. 110 a; Targ. to Ecl. 1 113.

⁴² *C. Cels.*, i. 25.

⁴³ *Ezh. ad Martyr.*, § 46; cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i. 54.

⁴⁴ Cf. Cheyne, *Religious Life*, p. 196.

The explanation that was most generally accepted at that period, however, was different. πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμονία (Ps. 95 (96) 5; cf. 1 Ch. 16 26); ἐμίγησαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἔμαθον τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν . . . ἔθυσαν τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν τοῖς δαιμονίοις (Ps. 105 (106) 37); οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . οὐδὲ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων . . . ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ δαιμόνια (Rev. 9 20). This same idea apparently finds expression in 1 Corinthians: ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θύουσιν.⁴⁵ It was further explained that it was really God's doing that foreign nations should do so, for to all the people under the whole heaven he had at the beginning allotted the sun, moon, and stars, and all the host of heaven.⁴⁶ A slightly different theory held that when the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the children of men, he set the bounds of the people: κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (Dt. 32 8). So ἐκάστῳ ἔθνει κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον (Ecclus. 17 17). There is special mention of princes of Persia (Dan. 10 13. 20) and Greece (Dan. 10 20), and likewise of Israel; that of Israel is called Michael (Dan. 10 13. 21 12 1).

The steadfast Jew of the Maccabæan period would have been more than human if, altogether apart from theological opinion, he had considered the god of the heathen oppressor aught else but a demon, and a very powerful and vicious one at that, when he saw the blasphemies (2 Macc. 6 4) that were committed in Judah and Jerusalem, the destruction of the people, the desolation of the holy city, the sanctuary in the hands of strangers (1 Macc. 2 1-14), the high priest sending sacrifices for Herakles at Tyre (2 Macc. 4 19), the foreigner commanding that the holy temple be called by the name of Zeus Olympius (2 Macc. 6 2), the stranger coming as a man of peace and then cutting down the unsuspecting multitudes on the Sabbath day, and when he saw his own brethren forsaking the law of his fathers and of his God (1 Macc. 1 52).

This particular state of affairs of course was transient, but on that account not necessarily quickly forgotten. It was

⁴⁵ 1 Cor. 10 20; cf. Baruch, 4 7 (Swete), Dt. 32 17 6.

⁴⁶ Dt. 4 19; cf. 29 25. A different explanation in Enoch 19 1.

one phase of a condition that was not transient, but one that was to endure. The cosmopolitan ideas of Alexander the Great, carried on by warrior and trader, pervaded the whole civilized world during the Hellenistic age. The greatness of the man is seen in the ambition that set itself to carry not only Greek arms to every land, but also Greek manners and customs, Greek language, Greek culture, enlisting all the virtues and energies of Asian life, and organizing them in a system and with a spirit that was Greek. His greatness is seen in the permanence of this conquest of Greek civilization in the face of the dissolution of Greek rule. With so much new in this life that was attractive, — opportunities for military service, for political and financial usefulness; more fertile lands abroad, commerce, cities, — with so much that was repellent, and the inability of any man to flee it or avoid it, it would be incredible if its influence on Jewish religion could not be seen, if the influence that lay behind this movement did not make itself felt — the influence of its religion, its gods, its chief god. The gods of the nations are demons.

In each of the prominent religions of the period one god held a preëminent place, and he was a sky-god. We have already mentioned in connection with the discussion of the relation of 'temple' and 'heaven' to 'dwelling of God' that this was the case in the Jewish religion. It is worth pointing out here to how great an extent it is true that the God of the Jews was God of heaven. In the first book of Maccabees there are almost a dozen examples of the use of heaven by metonymy for God;⁴⁷ in the second book there are almost as many.⁴⁸ The God of the Jews is called God or Lord or King of Heaven in many places.⁴⁹ This is found put in the mouths of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, and in the edicts of Darius and Artaxerxes; it is used by the Jews in

⁴⁷ 1 Macc. 3 18, 50 4 10, 24, 40, 55 5 21 9 46 12 15 16 3.

⁴⁸ 2 Macc. 7 11 8 20 9 4, 20 11 10 14 24 15 34.

⁴⁹ Ezra 1 2 5 11, 12 6 9, 10 7 12, 21, 23, 23, Neh. 1 4, 5 2 4, 20, Dan. 2 18, 19, 37, 44 4 37 5 23, Jonah 1 9, Ps. 136 26, Tobit 13 11, 2 Macc. 15 23. Cf. for the identical usage in the Assuan papyri, Sachau, *Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden*, no. I, 2, 27; II, 26; III, 3.

addressing men of other religions, and in speaking among themselves. Such expressions as אֲבִינוּ שֶׁבְשָׁמַיִם are very common in Rabbinical literature,⁵⁰ and simply represent the popular usage of the time.⁵¹ Jesus adopted this usage as suitable to his purpose: Πατήρ ὁ ἐν (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς is found thirteen times in Matthew, Πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος seven times.⁵²

Similar to this is the cultus of Baalshamem — "the god who dwells in the heavens, to whom the heavens belong."⁵³ A great deal of the material on this subject has been gathered together by Lidzbarski;⁵⁴ from this it is clear that for the later time traces of this cultus are to be found in the whole north Semitic world from Sardinia and Carthage to Palmyra. In many cases he had risen far above the local Baals, e.g. at Palmyra; in some it may be that he had supplanted them. Lidzbarski's results need now to be revised in two respects: the occurrence of the name in an inscription of Esarhaddon,⁵⁵ and in one of Zakir, king of Hamath and La'ash,⁵⁶ necessitates a much earlier date for the beginning of the cult than Lidzbarski had supposed;⁵⁷ and the occurrence of the name in the Zakir inscription alongside of the names of other gods removes the objections he raised against supposing that the Dhū Samāwī of South Arabia was equivalent to Baalshamem.

The same general conditions prevailed in the important non-Semitic religions of the period. It is not necessary to demonstrate this;⁵⁸ our problem is to show how the Jews

⁵⁰ In the Mishna: Sota 49 a, b, Aboth 23 a, Rosh ha-Shanah 29 a, Yoma 85 b.

⁵¹ Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 188.

⁵² Hawkins, *Horæ Syn.*¹, p. 26.

⁵³ Moore, *Ency. Biblica*, "Baal," § 4.

⁵⁴ *Ephemeris*, i. p. 243 ff.

⁵⁵ Schrader, *Keilinschriften*³, p. 357.

⁵⁶ Pognon, *Inscriptions sémitiques*, 1908, pp. 156-178.

⁵⁷ Cf. Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, iii. p. 1 ff.; Montgomery, *JBL*, 1909, p. 67.

⁵⁸ Farrell, *Cults of the Greek States*, says: In the Greek theory concerning the physical world and the powers that ruled it, we find beneath the bewildering mass of cults and legends a certain vague tendency that makes for monotheism, a certain fusion of persons in one; namely, Zeus. This tendency is genuine and expressed in the popular cult, and is to be distinguished from the later philosophical movement. Thus Zeus could be identi-

regarded the situation, and that is clear. The religions with which they were brought face to face in no uncertain way in the New Testament period were those of Greece and Rome with their gods, Zeus and Jupiter.

The one passage in the Old Testament which throws light on the Jewish attitude to these religions is the famous שָׁקוּ שָׁמַם of Daniel.⁵⁹ There seems no longer any reason for doubting that this is a contemptuous allusion to בעל שמים,⁶⁰ from which we may infer that בעל שמים was the name applied by the Jews to the god worshiped by Antiochus. We need not stop to inquire whether that be Jupiter or Zeus; whichever it was, he was thought to be the one who had brought about the desolation of the sanctuary. The passage that bears the strongest testimony in favor of the theory that שָׁקוּ שָׁמַם is a perversion of בעל שמים, 2 Macc. 6 2, gives further proof of the fact that בעל שמים was the name the Jews applied to the god of the Greeks and Romans. In the Syriac version of this verse Zeus in the name Ζεὺς Ὀλυμπίος and Ζεὺς Ξενίος is rendered בעלשמן; in the Vulgate, Jupiter.

There is outside testimony to show that this association was general. Jerome in discussing Dan. 11 31 says that there was a statue erected to Jupiter Olympius; Syncellus⁶¹ says in the same connection that the temple was defiled by setting up in it Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου βδέλυγμα. Josephus,⁶² further, quotes Dios as saying that Hiram joined to the city of Tyre

fied with Poseidon as Zeus Ἐπάλιος and in Caria as Ζηνο-Ποσειδῶν; he would be identified also with Hades, not only in the poetry of Homer and Euripides, but by the worshipers at Corinth or Lebadeia. The fortunate mariner could offer up his thanksgiving either to Poseidon or Zeus ἀποβατήριος or Σωτήρ. The man who wanted a wind could pray to the various wind gods or to Zeus οὐριος or εὐάνεμος (i. p. 47). His worship has a political significance higher than any other (i. p. 61), a political significance such as belonged to no other Hellenic divinity (i. p. 63). No other Greek deity possessed so long a list of cult-names derived from names of people and towns (i. p. 63).

⁵⁹ Dan. 9 27 11 31 12 11; cf. 8 13.

⁶⁰ Cf. Nestle, *ZATW*, 1884, p. 248.

⁶¹ *Corpus Script. Hist. Byzan.*, vol. xi. 1. p. 543. See Grätz, *Gesch.*, ii. 2. p. 314 f.

⁶² *Ant.*, viii. 5, 3; c. *Ap.*, i. 17.

the temple of Olympian Zeus, which had stood by itself, and Menander as speaking of Hiram's dedication of the golden pillar that was in the temple of Zeus at Tyre. This temple is distinguished from those of Hercules and Astarte; that, together with the name applied to it, makes it very probable that it was the temple of Baalshamem. Philo of Byblus, according to Eusebius,⁶³ makes this association directly: *τούτου γὰρ θεὸν [Ἡλίου] ἐνόμιζον μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον, βεελσαμήν καλοῦντες, ὃ ἐστὶ παρὰ Φοίνιξι, κύριος οὐρανοῦ, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἑλλησι.* It is not of importance here that he confuses the sun with both Baalshamem and Zeus.

The people who were troubling the steadfast Jews in the New Testament period and for some generations preceding were from Greece and Rome. The god who had been the cause of all this trouble, the one whom these people worshiped, was known to the Jews as בעל שמים. He was a demon, that was plain; but as such it would never do to call him בעל שמים, for that, as we have seen, was the name of the god of the Jews. The mutilation of that name in Daniel shows how distasteful it was, to some of the Jews at least, to apply it to any but the true God. There were other words for heaven that were free from this association, that would suit the situation just as well—יילון, ריקיע, שחקים, שחקים, ובול, מעון, מכון, ערכות, were all used of heaven at this period. One, *zebul*, was chosen; why this particular one we do not know. Some of the above list, of course, are unsuited, but others not so unsuited. We have seen that *zebul* had often been used as the name of a god. It may be that this usage had persisted (there is some evidence that it had), that it had been interpreted in accordance with the developing meaning of *zebul*, and so had grown to fit the situation to which it was now applied.

To conjecture further on this subject would be to guess. But whatever may have been the reason of the choice of *zebul*, it is beyond dispute that the god of the hated foreign religion was a sky-god, that the word that would first sug-

⁶³ *Prep. Evang.*, 1. 10 beg.

gest itself as the proper designation for him as chief of the demons was unsuited on account of its associations, that Beelzebul was not so unsuited, but was satisfactory in every way, and was so applied. So Beelzebul, Lord of Heaven, came to be chief of the demons.

The one passage, which has a bearing on the subject of Beelzebul, which we have not yet discussed, only confirms this result. "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more shall they call them of his household!" Various suggestions have been made as to why Beelzebul is introduced here. The question that is to be answered is why the word *οικοδεσπότης* is used, and not some other word; and the answer is because of the ordinary meaning of *zebul*. It is a play on each other of the words *בעל זבול* and *בעל הבית* — *אם — לבעל הבית קראו בעל זבול* (cf. Peshitta).

Very little need be said of the interpretations of Beelzebul that have been offered hitherto. Almost all who have regarded Beelzebul as a real name have started out with the assumption that *zebul* meant dwelling, and then conjectured or guessed at its application in a name 'lord of the dwelling': because the demon took up his abode in human bodies; or because he had his dwelling in Tartarus or the nether world; or because he was prince of the powers of the air; or a planet was referred to; to be more exact, the planet Saturn, or perhaps the sky. This is not, so far as we know, an esoteric name; but if it were and there were no way of finding out its application but by guessing, it would be as well not to guess.

Some have supposed that Beelzebul is a euphonic modification of Baalzebul of Second Kings. Examples of changes similar phonetically have been adduced in sufficient number. The difficulty (which most who hold to this theory have avoided) is to explain the development in thought from Baalzebul to Beelzebul. To say that the fly is an unclean

and troublesome animal does not help much; nor yet is one persuaded that the missing link is found in כַּעַל רַכְבָּא—a phrase that is quite intelligible though apparently not understood by some who write on this subject. All the conjectures that have been made along this line have to be viewed in the light of what we *know* about how the Jews themselves in the New Testament period understood Baalzebub. There is positive evidence from Josephus, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and a passage in the Babylonian Talmud. Josephus⁶⁴ says that Ahaziah sent to Ekron to inquire of *Muiā*, “for that was the god’s name.” In the Greek translation of 2 Ki. 1 2 we read Ahaziah’s command: ἐπιζητήσατε ἐν τῇ βάλ μύϊαν θεόν Ἀκκαρῶν. We may feel confident that *μύϊα* is a translation of כּוֹב, and in the light of Josephus’ explanation, that it is here also regarded as a proper name. A Baraita preserved in the Babylonian Talmud⁶⁵ goes somewhat beyond this. It connects Baalberith, who is said to have been worshiped at Shechem after the death of Gideon, with Zebub of Ekron; and explains that the latter was a fly, and that people made images of him, and would carry one about in their pockets and kiss it. Early Christian interpreters, likewise, know nothing of any interpretation but that which connects the name with a fly—Theodoret on 2 Ki. 1; Philaster, *Divers. Hæres. Liber*; Gregory Nazianzen, *Contra Julian.*, orat. iv; Procopius of Gaza on 2 Ki. 1.

So we are forced to the conclusion that facts have not been adduced to show nor a suggestion made that would reasonably explain how the chief of the demons was evolved out of a Canaanite god taken over by the Philistines, who had a certain reputation as a giver of oracles, but about whom we have no further information, nor reason for supposing that the Jews of New Testament times had.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ *Ant.* ix. 2. 1.

⁶⁵ Shabbath 83 b.

⁶⁶ If, as seems probable, Baalzebub is a perversion of Baalzebul, it must be due to the author of the story or a very early editor. The earliest version knows only Baalzebul, and, what is more important, the *Baal* is intact, which would not have been the case had the word been changed in a late period. But there is no reason that I know of to suppose that any one in

The theory, proposed by Lightfoot⁶⁷ and adopted widely, that Beelzebub is an odious epithet applied to the chief of the demons, rests on error. He cites a passage of the Palestinian Talmud: ⁶⁸ אפילו אותם שפשמו ידיהם בזבול יש להם במחון, which he translates "Etiam illis, qui manus suos extenderunt, in stercoratorio (id est, in Idoleo vel Idololatria) est spes." To make his translation of זבול doubly sure he points to the occurrence of the word מזבלין in the same passage a few lines below. The passage he has translated owes its position to the fact that it is an interpretation of part of Ecclesiastes 94: מי אשר יחבר אל כל החיים יש במחון, which differs from one given directly above it. It has no connection whatever with מזבלין. What פשמו ידיהם בזבול does mean was pointed out on page 36. For further proof he quotes the expression יום ניבול חיבול היה. This is not our word at all; it is written with *yod*, and is doubtless to be pronounced with the same vowels as שקיץ⁶⁹—so it has no place in this discussion.

the New Testament period had any idea that Baalzebul was a perversion of Baalzebul. This with reference to C. Harris in Murray's Bible Dictionary (ed. Piercy, 1908, s. v. "Baalzebul"), who though he knows what Zebul means, fails in this respect to connect the names Baalzebul and Beelzebub, and also to interpret correctly the Zebul of Beelzebub.

⁶⁷ *Horæ Hebr.*, 1st ed. 1674, Eng. trans. 1684; on Matt. 12 24, Lk. 11 15.

⁶⁸ In the Zitomir edition it is Berachoth 56 b.

⁶⁹ So far as I know both the abstract noun and the verb from the same root are always found in the intensive stem.

The J. P. Morgan Collection of Coptic Manuscripts

HENRI HYVERNAT

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON

MR. J. P. MORGAN has just received from Paris what must be called the most complete, and from the point of view of ancient Christian art and literature, the most valuable collection of Coptic manuscripts as yet known.

It consists of fifty volumes, some of which contain as many as nine or ten different treatises. Nine or ten of them are still in their original bindings of the ninth or tenth century, and a dozen of them are adorned with full-page miniatures representing the Virgin with Her Divine Son at Her breast or sitting in Her lap, angels, martyrs, anchorites, and other saints. A wealth of decorations from the vegetable and animal realms runs along the margins and around the titles of the individual treatises. The bindings consist of boards made of layers of papyrus leaves taken from older manuscripts: the boards, almost half an inch thick, are covered in leather enriched with exquisite designs. One of these bindings covering a magnificent copy of the Four Gospels, is richly and tastefully decorated in red and gold, and shows on the inside the name of the Convent of the Archangel Michael, to which the collection belonged.

Many of the manuscripts are dated from the first half of the ninth to the latter half of the tenth century. They are the oldest dated Coptic manuscripts yet found, even as the miniatures and bindings, just referred to, are the earliest examples of the art of book-binding and decorating manuscripts among the Christians of Egypt.

The collection is rich in biblical manuscripts. It contains six complete books of the Old Testament, of which so far we

had but few fragments, viz., the books of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, the First and Second Books of Samuel, and the book of Isaiah. The New Testament is represented by three complete Gospels, viz., Matthew, Mark, and John (Luke is unfortunately incomplete), the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, the two of St. Peter, and the three of St. John, for all of which books heretofore we were dependent on fragments from many manuscripts of various, and, as a rule, of uncertain ages and provenances. There are only three liturgical manuscripts, a Lectionary, a Breviary, and an Antiphonary, but all three are absolutely unique and of the greatest importance for the history of the ancient Egyptian liturgies.

The apocryphal literature holds also a prominent place in Mr. Morgan's collection, either in the form of special treatises, as the life of St. John the Evangelist by Prochorus, and the Investiture of the Archangel Michael as chief of the heavenly hosts, or more commonly in the shape of homilies or discourses attributed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem or some other prominent Father of the Church. There are also numerous biographies of famous anchorites and cenobites, such as St. Anthony and St. Pacomius, and quite a number of interesting acts of martyrdom.

Most of those documents are couched in the Sahidic dialect, the home of which seems to have been Upper Egypt, but evidently it had spread in the Fayum, as a literary language, as early as the eighth or ninth century. For this wonderful collection was discovered by Arabs in the ruins of a monastery on the southwestern border of that region. Many of the colophons to be found at the end of the manuscripts make it clear beyond the possibility of a doubt that the manuscripts were all written in that province, and many of them in the convent itself, in the ruins of which they were found some twenty months ago, hidden away in a stone vat, with the writing outfits of the scribes: three ink-wells combined with calami cases, and two of the calami themselves, the latter consisting of reed stems sharpened into pens at both ends. The wells proper were of lead and contained

once a sponge imbibed with ink, exactly as customary nowadays in Egypt and other parts of the Orient.

Two other manuscripts, as also all the colophons, are written in the local Fayumic dialect. There is also a Bohairic manuscript, a copy of the Four Gospels. It contains unfortunately many lacunæ, but it has nevertheless a great critical value, as it is the oldest copy of the Four Gospels in that dialect.

What makes the extraordinary importance of the new Morgan collection is the fact that these documents are as a rule complete, while other collections, yet reputed so valuable, of Rome, Paris, and London, to name the principal ones only, generally consist of fragments. For the past two hundred years the Arabs have been wont to tear the manuscripts they discover, so as to give to each member of the tribe his share of the spoils, and also in the hope of securing higher prices by selling the manuscripts piecemeal to individual tourists, or explorers, who often pay as much as eighty dollars for a single leaf of volume, while they would hesitate to buy a whole volume at that rate.

We need not say that this method has proved fatal to the interest of science, as many of the scattered leaves will meet destruction by some cause or another before they find a purchaser, or they will remain indefinitely hidden away by the individual owners.

The most of the manuscripts of this new collection, the finest that was ever discovered, had already been divided into small bundles of leaves and distributed among a number of Arabs, and it would have gone the way of the former finds, but for the energy of Mr. Chussinat, head of the French institute of archeology at Cairo, who persuaded an antiquarian to hunt up the precious relics and buy them at whatever price the Arabs wanted for them.

America may well feel proud that one of her sons has endowed her with such a treasure of art and ancient literature. Thanks to Mr. J. P. Morgan, our country is coming gradually to the point where it will have nothing to envy the European countries for. Mr. Morgan has made up his

mind not to keep this magnificent collection hidden away among his priceless treasures, but with a truly liberal and scholarly spirit, he will see that the whole scientific world be given the benefit of it, and is now considering the means to that end.



